ANANTHACHARYA INDOLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE SERIES NO. XIX

General Editor:

K.K.A. VENKATACHARI

MUMUKSUPPATI OF PILLAI LOKACHARYA WITH MANAVALAMAMUNI'S COMMENTARY

Translated by

PATRICIA Y. MUMME

Printed by : The Balussery Press, Madras-600 005.

THE *MUMUKṢUPPAṬI* OF PIḶḶAI LOKĀCĀRYA
WITH MAṆAVĀḶAMĀMUNI'S COMMENTARY

translated by

PATRICIA Y. MUMME

ANANTHACHARYA
Indological Research Institute,
G. D. Somani Memorial School Bldg.,
BOMBAY–5.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

We are very happy to place this publication No. XIX 'Mumukṣuppaṭi' translated and annotated by Prof. Patricia Mumme, in the hands of our readers. An authentic translation of 'Mumukṣuppaṭi' by Piḷḷai Lokācārya with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary was a long felt desideratum. This work belongs to the most creative period of Śrīvaiṣṇava literature: unfortunately it was almost neglected outside the tradition. Maṇavāḷamāmuni is a figure much respected in the Guruparamparā of over half of population of Śrīvaiṣṇavas. The long felt need of a translation of this work has now been met by the translation by Prof. (Dr) Mrs. Patricia Mumme.

Patricia Mumme, is a scholar from Denison University of U.S.A. She is a very good scholar of Sanskrit and Tamil, having done her Doctorate on 'The Śrīvaiṣṇava soteriological dispute and its development in 13th to 15th centuries'. She visited India and was with the Institute from Sept. 1980 to June 1981, for her studies during her Doctorate studies. She was in India again from June 1986 to March 1987, for her work on Mumukṣuppaṭi. She has assiduously and indefatigably translated this Rahasya Grantha.

We hope and we are sure that this work will serve as a valuable guide for gaining knowledge and insight into the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. It is most valuable for all those who cannot study the Mumukṣuppaṭi in the original.

We are indeed happy that we have been in a position to place this work in the hands of Scholars, for their use and appreciation.

A major portion of cost of printing of this work was fully subsidised by the author. We are thankful to her for the same. Our thanks are also due to the Manager and the staff of Balussery Press, Triplicane Madras-5 for bringing out the book neatly and tidily and on time.

2 October 87 — *K.K.A. VENKATACHARI.*

Bombay. — *Founder Director.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many individuals and organizations that have played a vital role in seeing this translation project to fruition. First and foremost I must thank my advisor, Dr. K.K.A. Venkatachari, and the staff at Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute for their untiring efforts in helping me prepare the manuscript and publish the results. I am especially grateful to Dr. A. Thiruvengadathan of Madras for his painstaking care in proof-reading the manuscript and also proof-reading during the printing and offering invaluable suggestions. Without the generous financial support of the American Institute of Indian Studies, this project would not have been possible. Without the cooperation of Denison University and the computer assistance provided by its research fund, it could not have been completed so expeditiously. Without the financial and moral support of my husband and parents, working on it would not have been such a joy. To all of the above I express my deep gratitude.

PATRICIA Y. MUMME

NOTE REGARDING TRANSLITERATION

Śrīvaiṣṇava Maṇipravāḷa literature presents special problems in transliteration, since the script in which it was originally written (medieval Tamil/Grantha) is no longer in use and neither modern Tamil script nor Devanāgarī are adequate to the task. I have attempted to transliterate Sanskrit and Tamil words (and parts of words) according to the standard transliteration system recognized for each. This necessitates one compromise: the Tamil long vowels ஏ and ஓ have been transliterated e and o like their Sanskrit correlates, rather than marked as ē and ō. The Tamil short vowels எ and ஒ have been distinquished as ë and ö.

Roman	Tamil	Devanāgarī	Roman	Tamil	Devanāgarī
a	அ	अ	c	ச்	च्
ā	ஆ	आ	ch	,,	छ्
i	இ	इ	j	ஜ்	ज्
ī	ஈ	ई	jh	,,	झ्
u	உ	उ	ñ	ஞ்	ञ्
ū	ஊ	ऊ	ṭ	ட்	ट्
ë	எ	—	ṭh	,,	ठ्
e	ஏ	ए	ḍ	,,	ड्
ai	ஐ	ऐ	ḍh	,,	ढ्
ö	ஒ	—	ṇ	ண்	ण्
o	ஓ	ओ	t	த்	त्
au	ஔ	औ	th	,,	थ्
ṁ	ம்	•	d	,,	द्
ḥ	—	:	dh	,,	ध्
k	க்	क्	n	ந்	न्
kh	,,	ख्	p	ப்	प्
g	,,	ग्	ph	,,	फ्
gh	,,	घ्	b	,,	ब्
ṅ	ங்	ङ्	bh	,,	भ्
			m	ம்	म्

Roman	Tamil	Devanāgarī	Roman	Tamil	Devanāgarī
y	ய்	य्	ś	ஶ்	श्
r	ர்	र्	ṣ	ஷ்	ष्
l	ல்	ल्	s	ஸ்	स्
v	வ்	व्	h	ஹ்	ह्
ḻ	ழ்				
ḷ	ள்				
ṟ	ற்				
ṉ	ன்				

INTRODUCTION

The Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition has a long and illustrious history, drawing its inspiration from the Tamil hymns of the Āḻvārs as well as from the Sanskrit tradition of Vedāntic philosophy, Itihāsa-purāṇa, and Pāñcarātra Āgama. It is Rāmānuja (d. 1137) who is given the credit for establishing Śrīvaiṣṇavism as an orthodox tradition by wedding the devotional piety of the Āḻvārs with the philosophy of *Brahma Sūtras* and *Bhagavad Gītā*. The Śrīvaiṣṇava ācāryas who followed him continued the synthesis of "Ubhaya Vedānta" which he initiated. In their sectarian activities and written works they attempted to expound the devotion to Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa which Rāmānuja had taught as the means and end of the religious life. These ācāryas were convinced that the same message of devotional surrender to the one true Lord of all, Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, was the ultimate message of both Tamil and Sanskrit scriptures.

The voluminous theological treatises of the Śrīvaiṣṇava ācāryas following Rāmānuja have barely begun to get the kind of attention they deserve from Western scholars, mostly for linguistic reasons. While the Śrīvaiṣṇava ācāryas wrote in Sanskrit when they wanted to address their Advaitin, Buddhist, and Śaiva rivals, they generally used Maṇipravāḷa—a highly Sanskritized form of late medieval Tamil used only by Śrīvaiṣṇavas—when writing for readers within their own tradition. Only a handful of Western scholars are currently doing research in this rich and fascinating literature. An acute shortage of Maṇipravāḷa texts available in translation (into any language) has made it difficult for one outside

the sect to learn even the most basic teachings of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition after Rāmānuja. Given this state of Śrīvaiṣṇava scholarship, a translation of almost any text could not help but be a significant contribution.

At the same time, there are several reasons why a translation of this particular text is especially needed. The most creative period of Śrīvaiṣṇava literature—13th to 15th century—saw the emergence of a new genre of literature that has been almost entirely ignored by scholars outside the tradition : commentaries on the three Śrīvaiṣṇava secret mantras or "rahasyas". Of the scores of such treatises written, to date English translations of only two of them have been published : Vedānta Deśika's *Rahasyatrayasāra* and Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Mumukṣuppati* (without Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary). [1] These rahasya commentaries were a major vehicle of theological articulation in this formative period of Śrīvaiṣṇava doctrine. A complete picture of Śrīvaiṣṇava teaching and practice cannot be formed without taking into account these mantras and the body of literature interpreting them. Furthermore, the fact that none of the Maṇipravāḷa works of Maṇavāḷamāmuni, the reputed founder of the Tēṉkalai school of Śrīvaiṣṇavism, have been translated makes for a glaring need in Śrīvaiṣṇava scholarship. It is Maṇavāḷamāmuni whom over half of the current population of Śrīvaiṣṇavas respect as the major figure in their *guruparamparā* or line of instruction (stretching back through Maṇavāḷamāmuni, Rāmānuja, Yāmuna, Nāthamuni to Nammāḻvār and the Lord himself). It is Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary which made Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Mumukṣuppati* into the most highly revered and widely read rahasya commentary among the Tēṉkalai school. Therefore it seemed that a translation of the *Mumukṣuppati* of Piḷḷai Lokācārya, with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary, was called for in order to introduce this literature and this author to the scholarly community at large.

What are the Śrīvaiṣṇava mantras and how are they used? There are three such mantras, given below with a most rudimentary translation :

1) The Tirumantra (also known as Mūlamantra, or Aṣṭākṣara), "Om namo nārāyaṇāya"—"Om, homage to Nārāyaṇa."

2) The Dvayam, "Śrīman nārāyaṇa caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye ; śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ"—"I take refuge with the feet of Nārāyaṇa joined with Śrī ; Homage to Nārāyaṇa joined with Śrī."

3) The Caramaśloka (*Bhagavad Gītā* 18 : 66), "Sarvadharmān parityajya mām ekam śaraṇam vraja ; aham tvā sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ"—"Having relinquished all dharmas, resort to me alone as a refuge ; I will release you from all sins, be not grieved."

For at least seven centuries, these mantras have been given to every Śrīvaiṣṇava at the time of the initiating ritual of *pañcasaṁskāra.* Bestowing of these mantras, along with the *guruparamparā* showing the line of instruction through which they came, is one of the five aspects of this rite, without which no one can call himself a Śrīvaiṣṇava. [2] Every Śrīvaiṣṇava subsequently is to recite the *guruparamparā* daily (after bathing), with gratitude toward his ācārya. This is to be immediately followed by recitation of the three mantras, while reflecting on their meaning. He should then worship the domestic image (where the Tirumantra is also recited for the purpose of ritual purification). In addition, the three mantras—and particularly the Dvaya mantra—should be recited silently and reflected on throughout the day by the Śrīvaiṣṇava *adhikāri*.

Traditionally it has been understood that a few especially devout Śrivaiṣṇavas, after their *pañcasaṁskāra,* would seek further instruction in the meaning of the three mantras so as to be able to more fully understand and reflect upon their meaning. These profound meanings of the mantras are not to be taught to just anyone who has had *pañcasaṁskāra,* but only to those who are particularly eager to learn their truths and who demonstrate deep respect for the ācārya and his tradition. Under no circumstances are the mantras or their meanings to be given to or discussed with anyone without the proper qualification. This traditional use and treatment of the mantras has remained fairly constant up to recent times. Now that the printing press has made rahasya commentaries widely available and the inquiries of Western

scholarship have broken the code of secrecy surrounding the Veda itself, one might expect that there would be some compromise in the "secret" nature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava mantras. We now find that even the orthodox are generaly willing to share this teaching with anyone who is interested. However, there are some traditional Śrīvaiṣṇava ācāryas to this day who refuse to discuss the mantras with non–initiates.

HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE MANTRAS IN ŚRĪVAIṢṆAVISM

How long have these three mantras been in use by the Śrīvaiṣṇava community ? [3] As far as we can document, the order in which they are presented in this work (and in most, but not all, rahasya commentaries) seems to represent the chronological order of their acceptance : Tirumantra, Dvayam, and Caramaśloka. Use of the Tirumantra predates the Śrivaiṣṇava community itself, going back to the first Āḷvārs and probably earlier, to the epic period. The name of Nārāyaṇa is well–rooted in the later Vaiṣṇava upaniṣads (Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad, Subālopaniṣad) and in the *Mahābhārata* (especially the *mokṣadharma* section of the Śānti Parva). The brief *Nārāyaṇātharvaśira Upaniṣad,* quoted by Maṇavāḷamāmuni, [4] gives specific instruction in how the eight syllabled *(aṣṭākṣara)* mantra, "Om namo nārāyanāya," is to be pronounced. This is admittedly a late upaniṣad (of the Kṛṣṇa Yajur Veda), but probably not later than the middle of the epic period (thus around the first centuries B.C. or A.D.).

The first Āḷvār, Pöykai Āḷvār at the end of the sixth century, refers to the utterance of "Namo Nārāyaṇa" in his *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 91. [5] Tirumaḷicai Āḷvār (seventh century) in his *Tiruccantaviruttam* 77 states that "the people reciting the mantra consisting of eight letters will attain heaven." [6] Periyālvār in the early eighth century mentions recitation of "Namo Nārāyaṇa" in many places in his *Tiruppallāṇṭu* and *Përiyāḷvār Tirumöḷi.* [7] Tirumaṅkai Āḷvār, about a generation later, also has many similar references. One entire decade of his *Përiya Tirumöḷi* ends all stanzas with "If I have to utter a name, it is only that of Nārāyaṇa." [8]

About the same time, we begin to find scattered references to this mantra in the Purāṇas and Pāñcarātra saṁhitās, though dating this literature is extremely difficult. The story of Nārāyaṇa revealing this mantra to Nara in Badarikāśrama sounds like a Purāṇic incident, but I have not been able to locate it. The *Lakṣmī Tantra* mentions the eight—syllabled mantra, "Om namo nārāyaṇāya," as foremost among five *vyāpaka* mantras to the Lord. [9] A very influential Pāñcarātra text is the *Nāradīyam* or *Nāradīyakalpa*, which contains a section called the Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā. This gives detailed instructions for meditation on the eight—syllabled mantra, "Om namo nārāyaṇāya." This text is commonly quoted by Maṇavāḷamāmuni in commenting on the *Mumukṣuppati*, and by Vedānta Deśika in his *Rahasytrayasāra*. Unfortunately, the *Nāradīyam* has not been published. It may well be later than Rāmānuja.

The first reference to the Tirumantra in the works of the Śrīvaiṣṇava ācaryas occurs in Rāmānuja's *Nityagrantha,* a guidebook for the daily ritual practices of a Śrīvaiṣṇava. Though some have doubted his authorship of this work, [10] the arguments supporting that position are rather weak. The *Nityagrantha* refers repeatedly to the use of the Mūlamantra for self–purification in ritual contexts—during bathing, in connection with the *pūja,* etc. Though recitation of the *guruparamparā* is mentioned, there is no explicit reference to recitation of this (or any of the other) mantras in that context, as is the current practice. [11]

The Dvayamantra does not have such a long history. Its main teaching—the position of Śrī as the Lord's consort and mediator for the soul's salvation—is well–rooted in the hymns of the Āḻvārs, in Pāñcarātra, and in the works of the earliest ācāryas. [12] The first documentable evidence of the use of the Dvayamantra itself is in one of Rāmānuja's works. His *Śaraṇāgatigadya* refers twice to the Dvayam by name, though without stating it. After the passage where Rāmānuja takes refuge at the feet of the Lord there occurs the phrase "atra dvayam—here, the Dvayam." [13] Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition has taken this to mean recitation of the Dvayamantra ; it is because of its secret nature that Rāmānuja did not write down the text of the mantra itself.

Though some have regarded this phrase as an interpolation, this cannot be convincingly supported because of the closing lines of the same *gadya*, where Śrī says, "Remain contentedly in Srirangam for the rest of your days, ever uttering the Dvayam and reflecting on its meaning."[14]

The use of the Caramaśloka as a mantra undoubtedly developed even later in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. It is certain that both Yāmuna (early 11th century) and Rāmānuja considered the message of *Bhagavad Gītā* 18 : 66 as particularly significant. Yāmuna's *Gītārtha Saṅgraha,* a summary of the *Bhagavad Gītā* in 32 ślokas, appears to devote an entire śloka to clarifying its meaning :

> nijakarmādi bhaktyantam kuryāt prītyaiva kāritaḥ,
> upāyatām parityajya nyasyeddeve tu tāmabhīḥ.[15]

> Performing everything from his own karma to bhakti, he does them solely out of love. Renouncing the idea that [these performances] are the upāya, he should attribute that [idea of being the upāya] to god alone and not fear.

Rāmānuja elaborated Yāmuna's ideas into his own interpretation of 18 : 66 in the *Gītābhāsya,* which is aimed at refuting Śaṅkara's elaborate exegesis of this śloka. Śaṅkara had said that "sarva dharmān parityajya" enjoins refraining from all kinds of action, and that "mām ekam śaraṇam vraja" enjoins Arjuna to seek knowledge of the identity of Brahman and ātman through *jñānayoga*. Rāmānuja, like Yāmuna, affirms that what is meant is not actual renunciation of prescribed duties. Rather one should continue to perform them out of love, "with the complete renunciation of the sense of agency, possessiveness, results, etc. in the manner taught" while continually thinking of the Lord as "the agent, the object of worship, the goal of attainment and the means *(upāya)*.[16] Thus Kṛṣṇa is here enjoining *bhaktiyoga,* loving performance of required acts of *dharma* as worship of the Lord with the attitude of three-fold renunciation (of agency possessiveness and results) taught in 18 : 4. Rāmānuja also suggests an alternative intepretation. Kṛṣṇa recognized that Arjuna was discouraged at the weighty sins which were preventing him from

initiating *bhaktiyoga,* and that the rites necessary to expiate these sins were too difficult and time-consuming. Thus Kṛṣṇa says "In order to succeed in starting *bhaktiyoga,* surrender, finding refuge with me alone.........I shall release you from all [such] sins. Do not grieve." [17] In either case, it is *bhakti* to the personal Lord accompanied by acts of prescribed worship—not *jñāna* of the impersonal Brahman and renunciation of action—which is being enjoined according to Rāmānuja's interpretation.

It is significant, however, that neither Yāmuna nor Rāmānuja refer to *Gītā* 18 : 66 as the Caramaśloka. There is nothing in their interpretations to indicate that this śloka was used as a mantra in their time. In fact, the later tradition distinguishes the interpretation of this śloka made in Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya* from the use of śloka as a mantra. None of the extant commentaries on the three mantras appeal to or cite the two interpretations offered by Rāmānuja in his *Gītābhāṣya* when interpeting the Caramaśloka. The reason is that soon after Rāmānuja the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition began to recognize that there are basically two upāyas for mokṣa which Rāmānuja taught: *bhaktiyoga* as expounded in his *Gītābhāṣya,* and *prapatti,* surrender to the Lord alone as the upāya, which was illustrated in his *Śaraṇāgatigadya.* The *Gītābhāṣya* thus interprets the Caramaśloka only for the *bhaktiyogin,* who is enjoined to perform prapatti (surrender to the Lord) as an ancillary of *bhaktiyoga.* When used as a mantra, however, the Caramaśloka is interpreted as enjoining *prapatti,* not *bhaktiyoga.* This surrender to the Lord alone as the upāya, according to the Śrīvaiṣṇava traditional understanding, is the secret meaning of *Bhagavad Gīta* 18 : 66, a meaning with which Rāmānuja and Yāmuna were well familiar, but which they did not reveal in their written works out of respect for the secrecy of the mantra's meaning. The independent scholar, however, must conclude that there is no convincing evidence that Yāmuna or Rāmānuja recognized the use of the Caramaśloka as a mantra, or even that they recognized *prapatti* to be an upāya distinct from bhaktiyoga.

The later interpretation of the Caramaśloka as a mantra teaching *prapatti* alone (and not as an adjunct to bhaktiyoga) seems to owe more to a śloka from Yāmuna's *Stotraratna* than to

either *Gītārtha Saṅgraha* or *Gītābhāṣya.* *Stotraratna* 22 can be seen in retrospect as a first–person summary of the Caramaśloka as a mantra. Note that its first line differs markedly from the first line of *Gītārtha Saṅgraha* 31 :

> na dharmaniṣtho 'smi na cātmavedī na bhakti-
> māṁstvaccaraṇāravinde,
> akiñcano 'nanyagatiśśaraṇyaḥ tvatpādamūlam
> śaraṇam prapadye. [18]

> I have not performed dharma, nor do I know the ātman, nor have I devotion to your lotus feet. O savior, I am helpless, without any other recourse. Thus I seek refuge with your feet.

Here we see a foreshadowing of two important ideas which were developed fully in the next two centuries of Śrīvaiṣṇava theology : 1) that renunciation of dharmas enjoined by the Caramaśloka includes relinguishing not only karmayoga and jñānayoga but even bhaktiyoga, and 2) that surrendering to or seeking refuge with the Lord *(prapatti, śaraṇāgati)* may be something quite distinct from the way of devotion *(bhakti).* Citing this verse, the later tradition has also taught that *ākiñcanya* and *ananyagatitva*—helplessness and lack of any other refuge—are necessary qualfica-tions for prapatti. [19] All these ideas are extremely important in the later interpretation of the mantras. But it would be hasty to conclude on the basis of this one śloka that Yāmuna himself recognized prapatti to be a separate upāya, distinct from bhakti-yoga, or that he recognized the Caramaśloka as of particular importance in expounding this prapatti.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. *Śrīmad Rahasyatrayasāra*, tr. M. R. Rajagopala Ayyangar (Kumbakonam : Agnihotram Ramanuja Thatachariar, 1956) 591 pages, and *Mumukshupadi*, tr. M. B. Narasimha Iyengar (Madras : Educational Publishing, 1962) 36 pages. Both are long since out of print.

2. These five are : 1) *tāpa*—branding of the conch and discus on the shoulder, 2) *puṇḍra*—receiving the mark of Viṣṇu's footprint drawn in red and white powders on the forehead and various parts of the body, 3) *nāma*—receiving a Vaiṣṇava name, 4) *mantra*—receiving the mantras and *guruparamparā*, 5) *yāga*—literally, sacrifice, where the initiate receives an image of the Lord and instruction in how it is to be worshipped at the domestic shrine. The Tēṉkalais also include, as part of *pañcasaṁskāra,* surrender to the Lord through the ācārya, who introduces the initiate to the Lord and requests that he be saved by virtue of the *prapatti* that Rāmānuja performed in the *Śaraṇāgatigadya*. The Vaṭakalai practice is to make *prapatti*—surrender to the Lord—a voluntary rite quite separate from *pañcasaṁskāra.* They usually postpone *prapatti* until late in life.

3. For this section I am indebted to K. K. A. Venkatachari and his article, "Historical Study of Importance of Rahasyatraya in Śrīvaṣṇavism," which appeared in *Rāmānuja Vāṇi,* Vol. 2 no. 2, April 1979 (ed. and publ. by M. R. Sampatkumaran, Madras) pp. 67–75.

4. In his commentary on *cūrṇā* 28 in the Tirumantra section. The text of the upaniṣad is found in *Upaniṣat–Saṅgrahaḥ,* ed. J. L. Sastri (Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1984) pp. 151–2.

5. *Nālāyira Divya Prabandham,* ed. K. Venkataswami Reddiyar (Madras : Tiruvenkatattan Tirmunram, 1981). Hereafter abbreviated *NDP.*

6. *NDP.*

7. *Tiruppallāṇṭu* 4, 12; *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 5.1.3 and 5.1.6, *NDP.*

8. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 6.10.1–11. See also 1.8.9, and 8.10.3. *NDP.*

9. *Lakṣmī Tantra,* ed. V. Krishnamacharya (Madras: Adyar Library, 1959) 17.19 ff., and 24.68–74.

10. Robert Lester, in the introduction to his *Rāmānuja on the Yoga* (Madras: Adyar Library, 1976, p. xiv) says that Rāmānuja makes no reference to the three mantras. This position can only be supported by denying Rāmānuja's authorship of both the *Nityagrantha* and the *Saraṇāgatigadya,* which Lester does, following Agnihotram Rāmānuja Tathacharya of Kumbakonam.

11. See edition of *Nityagrantha* in *Śrī Bhagavad Rāmānuja Granthamālā,* ed. P. B. Annangaracharya (Kanchipuram: Granthamala Office, 1956).

12. Witness the position of Śrī seen in *Lakṣmī Tantra,* in Yāmuna's *Catuśśloki,* and in Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya.* For the latter two, see *Stotramālā,* ed. and publ. by P. B. Annangaracharya (Kanchi: 1969). Hereafter abbreviated *SM.*

13. *SM* p. 10.

14. *SM* pp. 11–12. Robert Lester has in the past explicitly rejected Rāmānuja's authorship of the *Śaraṇāgatigadya* (in Appendix II of his *Rāmānuja on the Yoga,* and in various other articles and papers). However, his arguments have been well refuted by John B. Carman in his *Theology of Rāmānuja* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1978) pp. 230–37, 298–300, and in K. K. A. Venkatachari's *The Maṇipravāḷa Literature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas* (Bombay: Ananthacharya Research Institute, 1978), pp. 95–100.

15. *Gītārthasaṅgraha* 31, from the text appearing as an appendix to the translation of Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya* by M. R. Sampatkumaran (Bombay : Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute, 1985 reprint).

16. Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya.* Adapted from the translation by M. R. Sampatkumaran, *op. cit.*

17. *Gītābhāṣya,* tr. Sampatkumaran, pp. 475–6.

18. *Stotraratna* 22, *SM.*

19. This phrase seems to be borrowed from a passage in *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā* 37.30–31 (ed. M. D. Ramanujacharya, Madras : Adyar Library Series vol. 4, 1966) where the one performing prapatti or *śaraṇāgati* is to say "I am helpless *(akiñcana)* with no way *(agati)*—you alone be my upāya." Maṇavāḷamāmuni cites both this passage and *Stotraratna* 22 in commenting on *cūrṇa* 120 of *Mumukṣuppaṭi.*

2

RAHASYA COMMENTARIES

With some certainty we can fix a date by which all three mantras were accepted and used as a unit by the Śrīvaiṣṇava community. Around the middle of the twelfth century, Parāśara Bhaṭṭar (son of Kūrattāḷvāṉ or Kūreśa, Rāmānuja's chief scribe) wrote the first commentary on the three mantras, his *Aṣṭaśloki*. (See Appendix I for text and translation.) Unlike most of the later commentaries in Maṇipravāḷa prose, his work consists of eight Sanskrit ślokas ; four of these interpret the Tirumantra, and two each are given to interpreting the Dvayam and Caramaśloka. Inclusion of the Caramaśloka—referred to as the "last words (caramam vākyam)" of the "charioteer" [Kṛṣṇa]—shows that at least by this date it was accepted as one among the other mantras. The text of the *Aṣṭaśloki* is very cryptic. Indeed, it would be impossible to translate without a knowledge of the rahasya commentatorial tradition. This would suggest that it is a summary of an existent body of oral tradition surrounding these mantras rather than a ground-breaking work. All the later Śrīvaiṣṇava commentaries seem to follow its general scheme of interpretation—or rather,—they follow the same oral tradition out of which Parāśara Bhaṭṭar's own work arose.

Nañjīyar, who probably wrote in the late twelfth century, is the next ācārya credited with a commentary on the rahasyas, the *Rahasyavivaraṇam Nuṟṟiyeṭṭu.* [1] From the title this would seem to be 108 Tamil stanzas explaining the three rahasyas. Unfortunately, this work has been lost. Nañjīyar is more well-known as the author of the commentary on the *Tiruvāymoḷi* in 9,000 granthas,

the *ōṉpatiṉāyirappaṭi*. Many passages of this work reveal how the interpretation and use of these mantras, especially the Tirumantra, had become an important aspect of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. For example, in *Tiruvāymoḻi* 10.5.1 Nammāḻvār says "eṇṇum tirunāmam tiṇṇam nāraṇame—the holy name on which one should think is indeed Nāraṇam." Naňjīyar, commenting on this line, raises the question why Nammāḻvār referred to the name of Nārāyaṇa rather than his mantra, omitted the "namas" and fourth case ending and said "Nāraṇam" rather than "Nārāyaṇa." The reason he gives is that unlike other mantras, this mantra gives its results even if said improperly. [2] In *Tiruvāymoḻi* 1. 2. 10, Nammāḻvār says to "take the strong feet of the illustrious Nārāyaṇa." Naňjīyar introduces the hymn by saying, "In this tenth stanza he presents the Tirumantra and advises one to remember that mantra and its meaning for the rest of one's life." [3]

The later commentaries on *Tiruvāymoḻi,* Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Irupattiṉālāyirappaṭi* and the *Ītu* of Vaṭakkuttiruvīti Piḷḷai, are replete with anecdotes showing how the teaching of the secret meanings of the mantras by the ācārya to the qualified disciple had become a Śrīvaiṣṇava institution. We may cite, as an example, an incident attributed to Naňjīyar from the *Ītu* on 6. 10. 4:

> A man who had come to learn at the feet of Naňjīyar asked him: "If God Himself is to serve as the means to attain salvation, what is the necessity for complete surrender to God *(prapatti)* ?" Naňjīyar, hearing this, was flabbergasted. He cried out, saying "O what a sinner I have been! I have revealed to you, an ignoramus, the meaning and purport of the Dvayam, which our ācāryas have imparted in great confidence and secrecy since the days of Nāthamuni." So saying, he beat his own head in mortification, retreated inside his bedroom, and shut himself in. [4]

With Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai (1167–1262) Maṇipravāḷa commentaries on the rahasyas become a recognized genre. He wrote at least two such works, the lengthy *Parantarahasya* and the shorter *Nigamanappaṭi* which supposedly summarizes it. There has been some controversy within the Śrīvaiṣṇava community in recent years over whether Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai or his adopted son Nāyaṉār Āccāṉ Piḷḷai (1227–1327) is the author of these works.[5] *Pĕriya Tirumuti Aṭaivu* attributes both to the elder Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai and this position seems to be more well-grounded.[6] A translation of the *Nigamanappati* has been included here in Appendix II as an example of a rahasya commentary midway between *Aṣṭāślokī* and the *Mumukṣuppaṭi*, both in terms of chronology and length. Its debt to *Aṣṭāślokī* is readily apparent. Note particularly the paragraph in the Tirumantra section beginning "If one has the notion . . . " ; this follows the format of *Aṣṭāślokī* 4, but with some difference in the meanings it connects with the letters and words of the Tirumantra. Virtually all of the important technical terms and concepts used in the later and more elaborate commentaries are referred to in *Nigamanappaṭi.*

Piḷḷai Lokācārya (1205–1311) expanded the tradition of rahasya commentaries by writing a variety of them of many different lengths. He is known as the author of eighteen rahasyas in Maṇipravāḷa, but not all these "rahasyas" were interpretations of the three mantras. By this time the genre "rahasya" could include almost any doctrinal work in Maṇipravāḷa. Of these eighteen, four deal with the interpretation of all three mantras: The *Yādṛcchikappaṭi* (2 pages), the *Mumukṣuppaṭi* (15 pages), the *Śriyaḥpatippaṭi* (22 pages), and the elaborate *Parantapaṭi* (84 pages).[7] Four deal with individual mantras : The *Taṉidvayam* on the Dvayam, the *Taṉicaramam* on the Caramaśloka, the *Navavidhasambandham* which explains the nine kinds of relationship between the soul and Lord as shown in the Tirumantra, and the *Taṉipraṇavam* on the "om" in the Tirumantra. The volume and variety of commentaries produced by Piḷḷai Lokācārya—and by his contemporary, Vedānta Deśika—probably show a flowering of interest in the mantras and their interpretation in the late 13th to early 14th century. There was a need to make their meanings available to all members of the Śrīvaiṣṇava community, who no

doubt represented a wide gamut of different educational qualifications and levels of interest. Thus many such works were composed, from the short and simple to the long and detailed, in order to suit the various capacities of all. One of the most difficult and elaborate commentaries of this time is that of Piḷḷai Lokācārya's younger brother, the *Aruḷiccēyal Rahasya* of Alakiyamaṇavāḷa Pērumāḷ Nāyaṉār, who was a specialist in the *Nālāyira Divya Prabandham.* [8] Like his *Ācārya Hṛdayam,* it is replete with cryptic allusions to the hymns of the Āḻvārs.

There were other less well-known rahasya commentaries written in the same general period. Vādikeśari Jīyar (1242–1350), a disciple of Nāyaṉār Āccāṉ Piḷḷai, wrote a Rahasyatraya commentary in Sanskrit (called *Rahasyatrayārthavivaraṇam* or *Vādikesari Kārikā*) and which Maṇavāḷamāmuni quotes in his *Mumukṣuppati* commentary. (See *cūrṇā* 75, following). I have not been able to consult copies of these texts, unfortunately, though they are extant. There are several lost rahasya commentaries which *Pēriya Tirumuti Aṭaivu* attributes to various ācāryas from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Nampiḷḷai's son Rāmānujācārya (who would have been a contemporary of Pēriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai) is credited with a rahasya commentary. [9] A Sanskrit commentary on the three mantras is attributed to Śrīman Nārāyaṇa Jīyar, who might have been a contemporary of Maṇavāḷamāmuni. [10]

Vedānta Deśika (1269–1370) came from a line of ācāryas in Kanchipuram who had not shown any interest in the interpretation of the three mantras. [11] He compensated for this by besting Piḷḷai Lokācārya in the number and volume of commentaries he produced on the three mantras. He wrote many short to medium-sized rahasya commentaries in Maṇipravāla pairing each one with an exegesis of the three *tattvas* of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta philosophy. Thus his *Rahasyapadavī, Rahasyanavanītam, Rahasyasandeśam, Rahasyaratnāvaḷī, Rahasyamātrukai, Rahasyatrayacuḷakam,* and *Rahasyaśikhāmaṇi* have companion works entitled *Tattvapadavī, Tattvavanītam,* etc. of comparable size and level of difficulty. Two of these shorter rahasyas have subcommentaries which he himself wrote: *Rahasyasandeśa Vivaraṇam* and *Rahasyaratnāvaḷī Hṛdayam.* His best known and most elaborate rahasya commentary (which some

say was the last one he wrote) is the *Rahasyatrayasāra*, of which only three chapters (one for each mantra) are specifically devoted to the interpretation of the three mantras. One chapter deals with the three *tattvas*, and the rest is an exhaustive analysis of nearly every aspect of Śrīvaiṣṇava doctrine and practice. It is clear that one of Vedānta Desika's chief concerns in this work is to refute or soften the doctrinal claims and interpetations made by Piḷḷai Lokācārya, Alakiyamaṇavāḷa Pĕrumāḷ Nāyanār, and their colleagues of the Srirangam school.

Maṇavāḷamāmuni (1370–1443), follwing in the lineage of the Srirangam school after Vedānta Deśika, was in the unique position of being able to reaffirm the doctrinal positions of Piḷḷai Lokācārya et. al. against the criticisms of Vedānta Deśika. Rather than writing independent rahasya commentaries or doctrinal treatises of his own, Maṇavāḷamāmuni secured the importance of the works of his predecessors by writing lucid commentaries on them. In his introduction he says that Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Mumukṣuppati* was already the most widely read rahasya commentary of the time. But no doubt his commentary, known as the *Tirumantrārtham*, enhanced its status even more. Maṇavāḷamāmuni seems to have been a very popular and influential sectarian leader. By gathering around himself a host of loyal disciples, and by clearly expounding the doctrinal positions of Piḷḷai Lokācārya and his colleagues, he defined the theology of what would later be known as the Tĕṉkalai school. However, there is no evidence that during Maṇavāḷamāmuni's time there was any clear consciousness of there being two rival factions in the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition.[12] The idea that there were two schools of thought in Śrīvaiṣṇavism, one centered around Kanchi and the works of Vedānta Deśika (the Vaṭakalai or northern school) and another centered in Srirangam around Maṇavāḷamāmuni and the authors he revered (the Tĕṉkalai or southern school) did not arise until at least the sixteenth century.[13] The full-blown Tĕṉkalai–Vaṭakalai schism—with its bitter rivalry over temple control—erupted even later, in the late seventeenth or eighteenth centuries. Nevertheless, the major doctrinal positions of what would eventually become the Tĕṉkalai and Vaṭakalai sects were fairly well defined in the works of Maṇavāḷamāmuni and Vedānta Deśika. Since many of those doctrinal differences arose

in the context of interpreting the three mantras, a comparison of Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary on the *Mumukṣuppaṭi* with the interpretation seen in Vedānta Deśika's *Rahasyatrayasāra* will shed light on some of the major areas of dispute between the two schools.

Before doing that, however, something should be said about the variety and the similarity in the sources we find used in rahasya commentaries. Basically the works cited in interpreting the three mantras run the gamut of the entire range of literature accepted as authoritative by the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. On the Sanskrit side, this includes the Vedic Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads, the epics *(Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata), Bhagavad Gītā,* Purāṇas, Dharmaśāstras, and Pāñcarātra Āgamas. The Tamil hymns of the Āḷvārs are cited freely, as are the works of previous ācāryas : Rāmānuja's *bhāṣyas, gadyas,* and *Vedārtha Saṅgraha ;* the stotras of Yāmuna, Kūrattāḷvān, and Parāśara Bhaṭṭar; the earlier rahasya commentaries. Anecdotes and sayings attributed to previous ācāryas are also commonly referred to for support or illustration. Analogies and similes from everyday life are similarly utilized for support or illustration. The similarity of sources cited across the board, in all the rahasya commentaries, bears witness to a strong and long-standing oral tradition. In any given context, you may find Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai, Piḷḷai Lokācārya, Vedānta Deśika, and Maṇavāḷamāmuni all appealing to the same citation from Itihāsa-purāṇa or Pāñcarātra, the same anecdote or simile, and/or the same verses from the Āḷvārs. Though differences in interpretation do arise (especially between Vedānta Deśika and the Srirangam ācāryas on the interpretation of the Caramaśloka as will be explained below), much more unanimity than difference will be found between the rahasya commentaries of any two authors. The closer any two rahasya commentaries are in length, the more likely they are to cite the same number and type of sources. One point is to be noted, however : Vedānta Deśika, consistent with his view that the Veda should not be read by women or śūdras, refrains

from quoting *śruti* in his Maṇipravāḷa rahasya commentaries which are liable to be read by anyone in the Śrīvaiṣṇava community. The Tēṉkalai ācāryas, however, do not hold to this view ; thus Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary cites the Upaniṣads and Saṁhitās where appropriate.

MAṆAVĀḶAMĀMUNI AND VEDĀNTA DEŚIKA ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE THREE MANTRAS

This is not the place to go into an exhaustive explanation of the doctrinal differences between the Tēṉkalai, and Vaṭakalai schools as seen in the works of Maṇavāḷamāmuni and Vedānta Deśika.[14] Here we must confine ourselves to the issues that arise in interpreting the three mantras. Though most of Maṇavāḷamāmuni's differences with Vedānta Deśika's interpretation have been noted in the footnotes in the text, a brief overview will be helpful by way of introduction.

It is significant that in the interpretation of the Tirumantra, the mantra with the longest history and oldest body of traditional interpretation, there are no real points of dispute. In passing, of course, Vedānta Deśika will refer to the performance of prapatti as a *sādhyopāya* which is accompanied by *aṅgas*, a view not shared by Maṇavāḷamāmuni and the authors of the Srirangam tradition. The latter will emphasize that prapatti is merely knowledge of the *svarūpa* and/or mental choosing of the Lord as the upāya, and is itself neither an act nor an upāya. However, this difference does not really arise out of specific disagreements in the interpretation of the Tirumantra so much as out of their more general disagreement on the nature of prapatti. This same disagreement will be noticeable in their respective interpretations of the Dvayam and Caramaśloka as well.

Though the meaning of the Tirumantra is not in dispute, there is an important difference between the two schools in how it is used. Vedānta Deśika, and the Vaṭakalai tradition following him, feel that the Praṇava, being a Vedic mantra, is not to be given to women or members of non–twice–born castes. Desika argues for this practice in his *Rahasyatrayasāra,* quoting the *Nāradīyakalpam*

which recommends giving only "namo nārāyaṇa" or "namo nārāyaṇāya" to women and śūdras. He also appeals to the Āḻvārs, who never used the Praṇava when referring to this mantra or to the name of Nārāyaṇa.[15] The Tĕṅkalai ācāryas to this day feel differently; they do not hesitate to give the full eight syllables of the Tirumantra, with Praṇava, to women and śūdras as well as brahmin males. Maṇavāḷamāmuni quickly dismisses any possible support for Vedānta Deśika's view in *cūrṇa* 28, quoting the *Nārāyaṇātharvaśira Upaniṣad* to establish that the eight syllabled mantra includes the *om*. He flately states that any other way of construing this mantra is "not Vedic and ought to be rejected."

In the interpretation of the Dvayam there is really only one major point of dispute, that regarding the position of Śrī, or Lakṣmī. All agree that the "nārāyaṇa" in the first sentence of the Dvayam refers to the Lord as the upayā or means for salvation; the "nārāyaṇa" in the second sentence refers to the Lord as the upeya or goal of salvation, as the recipient of the service rendered by the soul. In both cases the word "nārāyaṇa" is modified by the phrase "joined with Śrī" *(śrīman, śrīmate)*. What is her position in each sentence? Maṇavāḷamāmuni and his predecessor have interpreted Śrī's role as a mediator *(puruṣakāra)* in the first sentence; she does not share the Lord's status as an upāya, for that would compromise the Lord' self-sufficiency or lack of need for any other aid when acting as the means of salvation. In the second sentence, however, she shares the Lord's status as the *upeya*, for both she and the Lord accept the soul's service. Vedānta Deśika argues that it is indefensible to interpret the "śrīmat" differently in the two sentences. As the Lord's inseparable attribute, she cannot be divorced from him either when he acts as the upeya or when he acts as the upāya. Her special function is mediating, since she is the very embodiment of the Lord's compassion. Nevertheless, as an aspect of the Lord himself, she shares all his qualities of lordliness, supremacy, upāyatva, upeyatva, etc. The underlying issue here, which is not fully brought out in Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary, is whether

Śrī is an atomic-sized soul *(jīva)*, thus to be classified in the *cit–tattva*, or whether she is an aspect of the Lord himself, thus to be classified in the *īśvara–tattva*. The former is the Tēṉkalai view, while Vedānta Deśika supports the latter position. Maṇavāḷamāmuni never explicitly refers to Śrī's *aṇutva* or *jīvatva* in his commentary on the *Mumukṣuppati ;* this doctrine is brought out more fully in Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Parantarahasya.*[16] But when seen in the light of this teaching, the Tĕṉkalai rationale for denying Śrī's *upāyatva* and affirming her *upeyatva* seems much more consistent. In so doing, Maṇavāḷamāmuni and the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas preserve Śrī's "middle" position as a mediator. Ranking higher than an ordinary jīva—yet lacking the Lord's autonomy, lordliness, supremacy, etc.—she is in a perfect position to act as a mediator.

It is in the interpretation of the Caramaśloka, the last mantra to be accepted in the Śrīvaiṣṇava rahasyatraya, that the most points of controversy arise between Vedānta Deśika and the Tĕṉkalai tradition as defended by Maṇavāḷamāmuni. Most important is the issue of whether the gerund form of the verb in "sarvadharmān parityajya—having relinquished all dharmas" is properly interpreted as a *vidhi* or as an *anuvāda.* That is, is Kṛṣṇa ordering one to give up bhaktiyoga and its ancillaries in favour of surrender to him? That would be the meaning if one interprets the gerund as a command or *vidhi,* as in the phrase "Having bathed, one should eat." Or, is Kṛṣṇa merely stating a condition that has already come about; that is, is he referring to the fact that Arjuna has already given up these other dharmas for some reason? This would be the meaning if one interprets *parityajya* as an *anuvāda,* as in the phrase "Having eaten [something forbidden], do the month–long fast." Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Maṇavāḷamāmuni make it clear that they affirm the *vidhi* position over the *anuvāda* interpretation. They do not shrink from drawing the unavoidable implication that bhaktiyoga and all the other upāyas for mokṣa, as taught in the scriptures and in the earlier portions of the *Gītā,* are not really effective upāyas at all. In fact, since they demand that the soul make efforts to save himself, these upāyas are contrary to the soul's essential dependence and subservience and are thus sins.

They were enjoined in the Veda only for those who are drunk with self — autonomy, as a way to wear away their pride. (See *cūrṇas* 188, 198 - 202, 267 - 69.) Vedānta Deśika objects to the *anuvāda* interpretation largely because of the unfavourable light it casts on the authority of scriptural injunctions. He and the Vaṭakalai school affirm that there are two equally valid upāyas to mokṣa taught by the Lord and expounded by Rāmānuja and the early ācaryas: bhaktiyoga with all its ancillaries and the simpler prapatti. These two upāyas are enjoined on two different groups of people; those qualified for bhaktiyoga are disqualified for prapatti and vice versa. Bhaktiyoga can be performed only by a twice - born male who has the patience, wherewithal, and energy to undergo its rigors for the rest of his life and possibly yet another life time. One lacking any one of these qualifications is automatically qualified for prapatti. After teaching bhaktiyoga to Arjuna, Kṛṣṇa recognized that Arjuna was grieved because he lacked the patience and capacity to perform it. Thus the Lord said "having relinquished all dharmas [that is, bhaktiyoga and its ancillaries] resort to me alone as a refuge [that is, perform prapatti, the alternate upāya]."[17]

This brings up the next major point of difference: the interpretation of the "ekam" in "mām ekam śaraṇam vraja." Both agree that the basic meaning is exclusion *(avadhāraṇa),* but how much does it exclude? Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Maṇavāḷamāmuni take it to exclude anything other than the Lord from being an upāya for mokṣa in any way. Thus they deny that prapatti, which for them consists largely of acceptance of the Lord's protection, can be called an upāya. It is the Lord's autonomous and gracious will which saves the soul; the soul's acceptance is a mere result or "epiphenomenon" of the Lord's grace. Thus, as Maṇavāḷamāmuni says, one is to think of one's own act of acceptance as worthless — that is, of no value in producing the goal. Even without it, the Lord would still save the soul. (See *cūrṇas* 219–227.) Vedānta Deśika objects to this view because of the problems *(prasaṅga)* of *sarvamukti* and *vaiṣamyanairghṛṇya.* If the Lord requires nothing of the soul to be saved, why haven't all souls been saved already *(sarvamukti)* ? The fact that they

haven't and that the Lord is seen to save some and not others, means that he can be accused of partiality to some *(vaiṣamya)* and cruelty to others *(nairghṛṇya)*. In order to preserve his egalitarian mercy and support the karmic laws of saṁsāra, says Deśika, the Lord or *siddhopāya* does not bring about for the soul's salvation without some sign or pretext *(vyāja)* — in the form of the performance of one of the *sādhyopāyas*, either bhaktiyoga or prapatti. Performance of these upayas is not contrary to the soul's nature, according to Vedānta Deśika, because the Lord has granted each soul the ability to make effort and act out of his own desire. The soul is dependent but has a god-given ability to act *(jīvakartṛtva)*. Therefore it is not contrary to the soul's nature to use that ability to perform one of the *sādhyopāyas* to express one's willingness to depend on the Lord as one's sole savior.[18]

The same issue underlines their disagreement on the interpretation of the word "vraja" To Maṇavāḷamāmuni and Piḷḷai Lokācārya, "vraja" is only mental affirmation or acceptance of the Lord as the upāya. It is not some act that is being enjoined as an upāya. Neither the relinquishing of other upāyas enjoined in "parityajya" nor the bare mental phenomenon of acceptance is an act; and since (as stated above) neither one produces the result of salvation, there is no basis at all for calling either one an upāya. (See *cūrṇās* 238-41.) Vedānta Deśika sees no harm in affirming that "vraja" enjoins the performance of prapatti along with its angas, in view of the soul's god - given ability to act (affirmed by the *Brahma Sūtras* themselves). He rejects the argument that mental acceptance or relinquishment are non-acts, for even refraining from action is a kind of action, preceded by knowledge, will, and effort.[19] Thus he finds their argument inconsistent.

The final area of dispute regards the interpretation of "sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi." Does the phrase "all sins" include even future offenses performed after seeking refuge? Does it include deliberate as well as unintentional sins? Both schools agree that surrendering to the Lord only once assures forgiveness of all past and subsequent unintentional sins, guaranteeing attainment of the Lord at the end of one's present lifetime.

But Vedānta Deśika, based on *Lakṣmī Tantra* 17:93, says that in case of any subsequent deliberate sin, another prapatti must be performed as a rite of atonement *(prāyaścitta)* in order to avoid some mild punishment for that sin (and possible prolongation of one's lifetime in order to experience that punishment). The ācāryas of the Srirangam school reject the idea of repeated prapatti as an atonement, appealing more to the adjacent verse in *Lakṣmī Tantra* which affirms that prapatti is to be done only once. At any rate, since it is not an act, there is no question of doing it again. When subsequent sins occur, for whatever reason, all one has to do is remember that one has sought refuge in the Lord as one's upāya, and that the Lord himself has promised to free one from all sins.[20]

LATER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RAHASYA TRADITION

The Śrīvaiṣṇava ācāryas continued to write rahasya commentaries and sub-commentaries on existing rahasya texts up to the present day. In the 17th to 19th centuries these were as often written in Sanṣkrit as Maṇipravāḷa. In the present century several noted ācāryas and scholars have published loose translations and simplifications of the classical rahasyas in simple. modern Tamil. Some new sub-commentaries on the earlies works have also appeared. However, none of these subsequent rahasya works has gained the popularity and prestige of the *Mumukṣuppati* with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary (for Tĕṉkalais) or the *Rahasyatrayasāra* of Vedānta Deśika (for Vaṭakalais).

We have seen that the number of mantras or rahasyas became fixed at three by the time of Parāśara Bhaṭṭar. No other mantras have been added since that time, at least not under the name of mantras. However, as far back as Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's time we begin to see signs of the proliferation of "caramaślokas." Now there are two more caramaślokas, in addition to that of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, which are esteemed by the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition as important in teaching prapatti: the Rāmāyaṇa and Varāha Caramaślokas.

The Rāmāyaṇa Caramaśloka is Rāma's words to Vibhīṣaṇa when the latter sought refuge:

sakṛdeva prapannāya tavāsmīti ca yācate,
abhayam sarvabhūtebhyo dadāmyetat vratam mama.
One whe resorts to me even once and pleads "I am yours,"
To him I give protection from all beings. This is my vow.[21]

Përiyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai has a lengthy commentary on this passage in his *Rāmāyaṇa Taniślokam,*[22] a work expounding significant passages of Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa.* His younger contemporary, Naṭatūr Ammāḷ of Kanchi, quotes this passage and the *Bhagavad Gītā's* Caramaśloka together introducing them as "what the Lord has disclosed in both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*".[23] Vedānta Deśika wrote an entire rahasya text on the meaning of this śloka, the *Abhayapradānasāra.* None of these authors refer to this passage as a caramaśloka so we may assume that this terminology arose later.

In this context we might point to a further development of the mantra tradition outside of Tamil Nadu in the tradition of Rāmānanda, who founded a sect bearing his name in the Benares area in the late 14th to early 15th centuries. Rāmānanda, who claims to be a Śrīvaiṣṇava in a *guruparamparā* descending from Rāmānuja, teaches three mantras in his *Śrīvaiṣṇava Matābja Bhāskara.* Two of these will be easily recognized as the Tirumantra and Dvayam with the name of Rāma substituted for that of Nārāyaṇa: the Mūlamantra "Om rāmāya namaḥ," and the Rāmadvayam "Śrīmad rāmacandra caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye, śrīmate rāmacandrāya namaḥ." The third mantra of the Rāmānandīya sect is none other than the Rāmāyana Caramaśloka itself, "Sakṛdeva prapannāya ..."[24] K. K. A. Venkatachari's recent investigations have brought to light that the terms and ideas Rāmānanda uses in interpreting these mantras show clearly that he has been influenced by the works of Përiyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai and possibly also Pillai Lokācārya.

The Varāha Caramaśloka consists of two ślokas supposedly spoken by the Lord to Bhūmi in the Varāha Purāṇa, though the passage is not found in current editions:

> sthite manasi susvasthe śarīre sati yo naraḥ
> dhātusāmye sthite smartā viśvarūpam ca māmajam
> tatastam mriyamāṇam tu kāṣṭhapāṣāṇasannibham
> aham smarāmi madbhaktam nayāmi paramām gatim.
>
> If a man whose mind and body are stable and strong, whose vital signs are good, should think of me, the unborn one in all forms, then when he is dying, and [lies inert] like a log or a stone, I will remember him, my devotee, and lead him to the supreme state.

Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai comments on this passage in his *Bhāratādi Taniślokam,* a work which interprets important ślokas from the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas."[25] Vedānta Deśika quotes it in Chapter 20 of his *Rahasyatrayasāra,* and has a rather elaborate exegesis of its meaning in his *Rahasyaśikhāmaṇi.* Though without referring to this passage as a caramaśloka, he emphasizes its importance in teaching prapatti as an easy path to mokṣa, one which does not demand that one's final thoughts be on the Lord (as does bhaktiyoga).[26]

Though it is not clear how far the practice goes back, these days both Tĕṉkalai and Vaṭakalai ācāryas recognize three caramaslokas — the *Bhagavad Gītā, Rāmāyaṇa,* and Varāha Caramaślokas— which are presented along with the Tirumantra, the Dvayam, and the *guruparamparā* to the Śrīvaiṣṇava initiate in the *pañcasaṁskāra* rite. As with the other mantras, the acceptance of these additional caramaślokas into their present position in Śrīvaiṣṇava theology and liturgy seems to have been a long and gradual historical process. Though I know of no doctrinal text which has been written for the specific purpose of interpreting the meaning of all three caramaślokas, that may well be the next step in the creative, ongoing tradition of rahasya commentary in the Śrīvaiṣṇava community.

Patricia Y. Mumme
Denison University
Granville, Ohio U. S.A.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This is according to *Pĕriya Tirumuṭi Aṭaivu,* a hagiographical work of around the late sixteenth century, which lists the major ācāryas, their gurus and disciples, and their works. See edition included as an appendix to the *Ārāyirappaṭi Guruparamparā Prabhāvam* (ed. and publ. by S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Trichy, n.d.) p. 590. The date of Nañjīyar is not well fixed, given as early as 1113–1208 or as late as 1182–1287· [For the dates in this work, I have generally followed the chronology of S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar's *Ācārya Vaibhavam* (Trichy: published by the author, n.d.) who gives the earlier date.] Maṇavāḷamāmuni refers (in *cūrṇā* 97, following) to a work by Naṭuvīḷtiruvīti Piḷḷai Bhaṭṭar, disciple of Paraśara Bhaṭṭar and probably an older contemporary of Nañjīyar. Given the context, it is possible that this work was also a rahasya commentary.

2. In *Bhagavad Viṣayam* [commentaries on Nammāḷvār's *Tiruvāymāḻi*], ed. and publ. by P. B. Annangaracharya, 5 vols (Kanchi : 1975—76). Hereafter referred to as *TVM.* No doubt because of Nañjīyar's remarks here, Piḷḷai Lokācārya also says in *cūrṇā* 17 of *Mumukṣuppati* (see following) that this mantra does not require recitation in a proper or orderly method.

3. *Ŏnpatiṉāyirappaṭi* on *TVM* 1. 2. 10.

4. As cited in K.K. A. Venkatachari's *The Maṇipravāḷa Literature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas* (Bombay : Ananthacharya Research Institute, 1978) p. 106.

5. The problem is that when Maṇavāḷamāmuni quotes *Parantarahasya* and *Māṇikkamālai* he attributes them only to "Āccān Piḷḷai." P. B. Annangaracharya (and Ayodhyā Rāmānuja Jīyar before him) have argued that he means only Nāyaṉār Āccāṉ Piḷḷai, for in Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary on

Pēriyālvār Tirumōli he refers to the Nālāyira Divya Prabandham commentaries of "Pēriyavāccān Piḷḷai." But K. Srinivasa Iyengar and his son S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar (of Trichy), themselves descendents of Pēriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai, have refuted this by pointing out that Maṇavāḷamāmuni attributes to "Āccāṉ Piḷḷai" some works which are indisputably the works of Pēriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai (such as the commentaries on Rāmānuja's *Gadyas*). *Pēriya Tirumuṭi Ataivu* attributes *Parantarahasya, Māṇikkamālai,* and *Nigamanappaṭi* all to the elder Pēriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai. K. K. A. Venkatachari feels that stylistic considerations also support that position.

6. p. 598. It also attributes to him a *Caramarahasya* and *Anusandhānarahasyam,* which seem to have been lost, unless the latter is the same as the *Rahasyatraya Dīpikā* or *Rahasyatraya Vivaraṇam* which has been included in K. Srinivasa Iyengar's edition of Pēriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's rahasyas(*Ettu Rahasya Granthaṅkaḷ,* Trichy: 1947). These two brief texts are nearly identical, suggesting that they are two variations of the same work. None of the works that *Pēriya Tirumuṭi Aṭaivu* attributes to Nāyaṉār Āccāṉ Piḷḷai seem to be rahasya commentaries.

7. Lengths are given for comparative purposes as they appear in the edition of *Aṣṭādaśa Rahasyam* by Ayodyā Rāmānuja Jīyar (Madras : K. V. Tirukkāccinambi Dāsa,1911). At this writing, an edition by S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar of Trichy is in press.

8. Edited by Velukkuti Varadacharya Swami (Trichy, S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, 1972)

9. *Pēriya Tirumuti Ataivu* p. 591.

10. *Pēriya Tirumuṭi Aṭaivu* p. 597.

11. *Prapanna Parijāta* of Naṭātūr Ammāḷ (Vātsya Varadācārya), Vedānta Deśika's guru's guru, is an important exegesis of

prappatti in Sanskrit. It mentions the three mantras but does not specifically elaborate or explain them. See edition and anonymous translation published in Madras by Viśiṣṭāvaita Prachārinī Sabhā, 1971.

12. Many scholars of Śrīvaiṣṇavism have erred in making this assumption, based on the later hagiographical sources such as *Yatīndrapravaṇa Prabhāvam* and the *Guruparamparāprabhāvams* of both the Tĕṉkalai and Vaṭakalai schools. These works, all of which were composed or suffered major interpolations after the 17th century, have read the Tĕṉkalai - Vaṭakalai rivalry of their own time back into the 13th to 15th century. But no work of that time shows any hint of such sectarian consciousness or rivalry.

13. *Pĕriya Tirumuṭi Aṭaivu,* written in the late 16th century refers to Vedānta Deśika as "the head of the entire northern tradition *(vatamargaḷukkĕllām śreṣtar)*" (p. 586). Following common usage, in the notes to the translation I have referred to Maṇavāḷamāmuni, Piḷḷai Lokācārya and his brother, and Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai and his disciples as the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas, and Vedānta Deśika and his immediate disciples and ācāryas as the Vaṭakalai ācāryas. This is an admitted anachronism, since they had no consciousness of being the leaders of separate sects.

14. The interested reader may refer to Patricia Y. Mumme, "The Theology of Maṇavāḷamāmuni : Toward an Understanding of the Tĕṉkalai - Vaṭakalai Dispute in Post - Rāmānuja Śrīvaiṣṇavism" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1983), forthcoming from New Era Publications (Madras) under the title *The Śrīvaiṣṇava Theological Dispute : Maṇavāḷamāmuni and Vedānta Deśika.*

15. *[Śrīmad]rahasyatrayasāra,* ed. and publ. with commentary by U. T. Viraraghavacharya (Madras ; 1980) ch. 27: pp. 822–24.

16. *Parantarahasya* and *Māṇikkamālai,* ed. P. B. Annangaracharya (Madras and Kanchi : Sat Grantha Prakasana Sabha, 1949)

pp. 8, 21–25. According to *Përiya Tirumuṭi Aṭaivu* (p. 598), Nāyaṉār Āccāṉ Piḷḷai is credited with a work entitled *Aṇutvapuruṣakāratva Samarthanam,* which, if still extant would be worth comparing to the view of Śrī seen in Deśika's works.

17. All these points are brought out in Deśika's *Rahasyatrayasāra,* ch. 29 [throughout], and ch. 24 : pp. 698, 704–9. See also Chapter Three of Mumme, "The Theology of Maṇavāḷamāmuni."

18 See Patricia Y. Mumme, "Jīvakartṛtva in Viśiṣṭādvaita and the Dispute over Prapatti in Vedānta Deśika and the Tëṉkalai Authors," ın S. S. Janaki, ed., *Professor Kuppuswami Sastri Birth Centenary Commemoration Volume,* pt. 2, (Madras : Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, 1985) pp. 99–117.

19. *Rahasatrayasāra,* ch. 29 : p. 1045.

20 Vedānta Deśika presents his view on prapatti as *prāyaścitta* in expounding the meaning of "sarvadharmān parityajya" and sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi." (See *Rahasyatrayasāra* chs. 25, 29.) Maṇavāḷamāmuni has only a brief reference to repeated performance of *prapatti* in commenting on "sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi" (*cūrṇa* 253). He has a fuller explanation when commenting on the present tense of "prapadye" in the Dvayam, where the key texts in *Lakṣmī Tantra* are quoted. (See *cūrṇas* 157–158.)

21. *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, critical edition by G. H. Bhatt et. al. (Baroda : Oriental Institute, 1950–75), 6. 12. 20.

22. In *Rāmāyaṇa Bhāratādi Taṉiślokam* of Përiyavāccāṉ Piḷḷaı, ed. and publ. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar (Trichy : n.d.) pp. 336–414.

23. *Prapanna Pārıjāta* 1. 29–31.

24. Rāmānanda's Sanskrit work *Śrīvaiṣṇava Matābja Bhāskara* (ed. Śrīrāma Ṭahaladāsa, Ayodhya : Sarayū Bhavana Press, 1935) is in the form of ten questions and answers. The mantras and their meanings are expounded in answer to the question, "What is to be recited *(kim jāpyam)*", in ślokas 11–52.

25. In *Rāmāyaṇa Bhāratādi Taniślokam,* pp. 79–87.

26. In *Amṛtāsvādinī Rahasyaṅkaḷ* (one of the two collections of Vedānta Deśika's smaller rahasyas) ed. and publ. Gomadam S. S. Ayyengar and V. N. Śrīrāma Deśika (Madras : Paraṅkuśa Mantīram, 1966) p. 201 ff.

THE TIRUMANTRA

The Lord of all and husband of Śrī, whom the eternally free souls enjoy, lives in Śrī Vaikuṇṭha in unsurpassed bliss. Yet he becomes very disturbed thinking of the destitute state of the souls *(cetana)*[1] in saṁsāra. For even though they have a right to live in communion with the Lord like those eternally free souls (*nityasūri*) who enjoy constant service, they have lost that right and are lying as if non-existent, described as "indeed non-existent."[2] While they are lying like birds with broken wings, bereft of limbs and organs, he grants them limbs and organs not so that they can wander away, but to enable them to take refuge in him and be saved. For the same reason he promulgates the revealed and unauthored *(apauruṣeya)*, eternally flawless, and self-authoritative Veda, along with the *smṛtis, itihāsas, purāṇas* etc., which explain and elaborate it.

Even then, since many qualifications must be met to study these scriptures, it is difficult for souls (*cetanar*) to gain knowledge and salvation by means of them. Bearing this in mind, [the Lord] thought, "We must make it so that they can learn the essential import of all the scriptures in a compact form." So the Lord himself, appearing as an *ācārya*, revealed the three *rahasyas* which explain the soul's true nature *(svarūpa)*, the means to salvation (*upāya*), and its goal (*puruṣārthā*) as they really are.

Of these *rahasyas*, he revealed the Tirumantra to Nara, who was a partial incarnation (*aṁśa*) of himself in Śrī Badarikāśrama. The Dvayam he revealed to his queen – the Goddess (*piraṭṭi*) – in

Śrī Viṣṇuloka. The Caramaśloka he revealed to his supplicant Arjuna in the chariot. For this reason the Lord is named in the beginning when reciting the line of teachers (*guruparampārā*), with the words "I praise the line of teachers beginning with the Lord of Lakṣmī, [up to our *ācārya,* with Nāthamuni and Yāmuna in the middle]."[3]

Subsequently, even though the words of the *rahasyas* are easily understood, the meaning has to be gained by instruction; it is only after understanding this [meaning] that one can be saved. Therefore, Piḷḷai Lokācārya, with his supreme mercy, clearly and understandably revealed through this book the special meanings of those *rahasyas* gained from the line of instruction from the former *ācāryas*. He had already composed three books on the three *rahasyas,* but the *Yadṛcchikappaṭi* was too short, the *Parantapati* was too long, and the *Śriyaḥpatippati* though it had neither of these two faults, was full of Sanskrit quotes such that women and the uneducated could not study it. Therefore, with a desire to compose one more book which would avoid these three faults, he wrote this book - the *Mumukṣuppati* - after all the others. As a result, everyone has been studying this book rather than any other. Furthermore, since there are some special meanings presented in this book which are not found in the previous books, it is to be preferred by everyone.

1. **The aspirant to** *mokṣa* (*mumukṣu*) **needs to know the three** *rahasyas.*

A *mumukṣu* is one who has a desire for mokṣa. Formed from the root (*muc*, to release, this word means "one in whom a desire for release from saṁāsra has arisen." Even though one who has a desire for attaining the *ātman* also has the quality of being a *mumukṣu*, he is not referred to here. He has no need to know the three *rahasyas*. Therefore, by the word *mumukṣu* [the author] means one who has a desire for the cessation of saṁsāra due to his desire to attain the Lord.[4]

Saying that such a person "needs to know the three *rahasyas*" means that since he has to know the soul's essential nature *(svarūpa)*, the means *(upāya)*, and the goal *(puruṣārtha)*, and

since these three *rahasyas* explain them correctly, he needs to know them. Indeed it is said, "The *mumukṣu* must obtain the three - fold knowledge - of himself, of the way to attainment *(prāpaka)*. and the goal to be attained *(prāpya)*.[5] His reference to the three *rahasyas* will be clear later on when he says that these are the Tirumantra, Dvayam, and Caramaśloka. These are called "rahasyas" because they are supreme secrets explaining the essential meaning of the entire Vedānta. Thus with this sentence he has specified the *adhikāri* and what he is to know.

Then, as to the question which of these three *rahasyas* is the first one, he says :

2. Among them, the first *rahasya* is the Tirumantra.

Among the three *rahasyas*, the first to be known by the *adhikāri* is the Tirumantra which deals with the nature of the soul as it truly is *(svarūpavāthātmya)* and which fosters full and perfect wisdom to discriminate between what is to be accepted and what is to be rejected. This mantra aims at explaining the soul's nature as it truly is, for, it explains [the soul's] three characteristics of 1) having subservience to no other *(ananyārhaśeṣatva)*, 2) having no other as a refuge *(ananyaśaraṇatva)* and 3) delighting in no other *(ananyabhogyatva)*. It furthermore explains cleary the distinction between what is to be rejected and accepted according to these [characteristics of the soul]. In the essential nature *(svarūpa)* of one who has been well instructed by this mantra will arise the desire for the means *(upāya)* and the goal *(upeya)* that are explained by the other two mantras. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with claiming that *(svarūpayāthātmya)*, is the first *rahasya*.

Furthermore, just as the rest of this mantra elaborates the Praṇava [the *aum*], the Dvayam elaborates the rest of the Tirumantra, and the Caramaśloka elaborates the Dvayam. By this logic, its primacy is established. So, bearing all these reasons in mind, he proclaims, "The first *rahasya* is the Tirumantra." It is said, "Since it protects [verbal root *trā*] the one who meditates on it *(mantṛ)*, it is called a *"mantra."* Thus this is called

a "*mantra*" because it protects the one who meditates on it by both the power of its sound and the realization of its meaning. For one who follows the other paths to mokṣa (*upāsaka*), and who uses it in sacred utterings and oblations and the like (*japa, homa*), it protects by the power of its sound. For the *prapanna* who considers the Lord alone to be the means and the goal (*upāya, upeya*), it protects by the power which comes from realizing its meaning. When one realizes its meaning, it becomes one's savior or protector. Bhaṭṭar has said :

> If he thinks that the soul is the body, the wise prapanna should learn the third syllable [in the *aum*, *m*]. If he is blind with autonomy, the first [*a*]. If subservient to another, the second [*u*]; if trying to protect himself, the word "namaḥ." If hankering after those who only appear to be kinsmen, the word "nārāyaṇa". If his mınd is involved in wordly matters, the dative case ending [on the word "nārāyaṇa"].[6]

This means that [the Tirumantra] guides the one who meditates on it to behave in accord with his true nature, making sure that [wrong notions such as] confusing the body and the soul (*dehātmābhimāna*), self - sufficiency or autonomy (*svātantrya*), subservience to another (*anyaśeṣatva*), seeking to save oneself (*svarakṣane svānaya*), and hankering for sense objects (*viṣayaprāvaṇya*) never occur again.

After this, with the intention to fully establish this *mantra*'s excellence, he reveals its execellence by stating the special way of meditating on it (*anusandhānakrama*).

3. As beffitting the excellence of the Tirumantra, one must reflect on it respectfully, with love.

The excellence of the Tirumantra lies in the following :

1) It is a summation of all the Vedas, as described [in the passage], "The Rig, Yajus, Sāma and Atharva - all are encompassed by the eight - syllabled [Tirumantra]."[7]

2) It explains all the truths which are to be known, as stated [in the hymn], "Rather than speaking of other things."[8]

3) It is the supreme mantra among mantras, the ultimate secret among secrets, the holiest among the holy, as stated [in the passage]:

> "The eternal Mūlamantra [Tirumantra] is the supreme mantra among mantras, the ultimate secret among secrets, the holiest among the holy."[9]

"As beffitting its excellence" means in accord with its great worth. "One must reflect on it respectfully, with love," means that when one meditates on it, it should not be done with an empty heart but with all the love one has for it, in recognition of its excellence. Furthermore, one should respect and cherish it so that this secret of secrets is not heard by those unqualified for it; for, it is said, "With effort one should protect the mantra."[10] This, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says, is the way we have to meditate on it, thus ruling that one is not to reflect on it by any other method.

Is it only if one has such love for it that the mantra will succeed ? To this he reveals :

4. If one has abundant love for the mantra, for the subject of the mantra, and for the *ācārya* who bestows the mantra, it will succeed.

One should have abundant love, in accord with their respective excellence for the following : 1) this mantra which proclaims the truths to be known, 2) the Lord, the one to whom this mantra refers, [who should be loved] on account of his three forms as the master *(śesī)*, savior *(śaraṇya)*, and goal *(prāpya)* and 3) the ācārya who has helped one, [and should be loved] in proportion to one's love for the mantra, since the mantra is in the hands of the ācārya. As it is said, "The mantra is under the control of the knower of Brahman."[11] If one has [such abundant love] then this mantra will succeed for him. As it is said :

> One should have devotion to these three – the mantra, deity, and the guru who gives the mantra – for this is the primary *sādhana*.[12]

After this, by telling how this mantra appeared [in the world], he reveals its unsurpassed excellence.

5. Those in *saṁsāra* have forgotten themselves and the Lord and have lost service to the Lord – it is so lost that they do not even know that they have lost it. Thus sunk in the sea of *saṁsāra,* they suffer. The Lord of all, out of his mercy *(kṛpā)*- so that they might know him and reach the other shore – himself became both the disciple and the *ācārya* and proclaimed the Tirumantra.

"Those in saṁsāra" means those bound souls *(baddhacetanar)* who are experiencing the torments of birth and death, subjected to the flood of ignorance, karma, karmic tendencies *(vāsanā)*, and desires because of their beginningless contact with insentient matter.

"Have forgotten themselves and the Lord" means that they do not know that they themselves are endowed by nature with the characteristic of subservience (*śeṣatva*) to the Lord, as it is said :

> All souls are by nature servants to the supreme spirit (*paramātman*). No other definition (*lakṣaṇa*) applies to them in bondage as well as in mokṣa.[13]

Nor do they know the Lord to be their unconditional master (*nirupādhikaśeṣī*) as stated in such passages as, "Lord of all,"[14] and "The quality of being the Lord and owner inheres in Brahman."[15] But why does he say "have forgotten" rather than "don't know"? Isn't the word "forgotten" used when one knew something at one time before and then lost that knowledge ? He says it this way only because he is thinking of the strength of the [*śeṣa – śeṣi*] relationship, For it is [so strong] that if one realizes that inherent relationship, it seems like a forgotten truth one had previously known, as [the Āḻvār] said, "I forgot you before."[16]

"And have lost service to the Lord" means that they have not been able to attain the supreme goal of serving the Lord who is ordained as their *śesī* due to the aforementioned ignorance. He says "have lost" thinking of the great value of that service and how, though he was born only for [that purpose] he has gone without attaining it.

"It is so lost that they do not even know they have lost it" means that since they are without knowledge of their own true nature (*svarūpa*) and that of the Lord, and since they are ignorant of the supreme goal, they don't regret the loss. They don't even think, "We have lost the supreme goal of service to the *śeṣī* which is in accord with our subservience (*śeṣatva*)."

"Thus sunk in the great ocean of saṁsāra, they suffer." This means that they are sunk in the great ocean of saṁsāra, the place of endless afflictions. [So wide] that its shores can't be reached by one's own efforts, it is described as "the terrible ocean of saṁsāra, full of endless torments."[17] Thus overcome by the three kinds of torments,[18] they suffer in pain.

So it has been stated that [the cetanas in saṁsāra] 1) do not know themselves, 2) do not know the Lord, 3) are ignorant of the supreme goal, 4) while suffering in the ocean of saṁsāra, do not realize that saṁsāra itself is the obstacle, and 5) do not know the means (*upāya*) to get out of it. Thus this means they are completely ignorant of the five truths (*arthapañcaka*) which are to be known. As stated in such passages as "The nature of Brahman who is to be attained...,"[19] all the scriptures propound the five truths. In order to make these truths easily understandable for [the cetanas], the Lord of all revealed the Tirumantra which is a summation of all the *śāstras*. Below, it is told how he did this.

"The Lord of all, out of his mercy," refers to the Lord who, since time immemorial, has shared a relationship with everyone as Lord and subject (*īśeśitavyasambandha*), as stated [in the passage], "since there is a beginningless relationship [between God and the soul] as Lord and subject.[20] This means "out of his uncaused

mercy (*nirhetukakṛpā*), arising merely upon seeing the miseries [his subjects] are experiencing," as stated [in the following passage] :

> For the soul, whirled around in the wheel of saṁṣāra by his karma, distraught with misery, unfathomable mercy springs forth from Viṣṇu.[21]

"So that they might know him and reach the other shore" means so that those who are lying in the ocean of saṁsāra, being tormented in this way, may know the one who is the means to get out. Thus they might cross over that sea of saṁsāra. For it is said, "Having attained you as a refuge, men cross over,"[22] and "For those sunk in the ocean of saṁsāra, with minds over-run by sense - objects, there is no way across at all but the boat called Viṣṇu".[23]

"Himself became the disciple and the ācārya" means he descended in the form of Nara and Nārāyaṇa – with Nara as the disciple and Nārāyaṇa as the ācārya – described [in the hymn], "He who, as Nara Nārāyaṇa, elaborated the book of dharma so that it would not be lost."[24]

"And revealed the Tirumantra" means he proclaimed the Tirumantra which is the summation of all the śāstras and which explains clearly and distinctly the five truths which are the essence of those śāstras. [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] does not say that [the Lord] composed [the Tirumantra] but "revealed" it (*prakāsippi–*). This he does in order to show 1) that [the Lord] revealed it as something eternal and did not just compose something and proclaim it, and 2) that he revealed this profound secret because he could not bear seeing the difficult situation [of souls in saṁsāra]

But isn't it enough for him to appear as an ācārya and reveal it ? Why did he become a disciple ? To this he says :

6. The people of the world did not know how a disciple (*śiṣya*) ought to be. Thus he became a disciple in order to make that known.

He did not only reveal this as an ācārya. He himself also became the disciple. The people of the world did not know the characteristics of a disciple; that is, that he should 1) desist from other aims, 2) be eager to adopt the *sādhana* for this aim, 3) feel oppressed [by saṁsāra and eager to get out of it] (*ārti*)[25], 4) be respectful, and 5) have no jealousy (*anasūya*). This has been stated in the following passages :

> One who is a believer, who conducts himself according to dharma, is of good character, a Vaiṣṇava, pure, serious, clever, and steadfast should be considered a disciple (*śiṣya*).[26]

> One who bears his body, wealth, intelligence, house, actions, qualities, and breaths for the *guru* he and no other should be considered a disciple.[27]

> A disciple who has a pure mind, reverence for good people, and exemplary conduct ; who is eager to know the truth, obedient, free of pride (*tyaktamāna*), self-effacing (*praṇipatanapara*), inquisitive, composed and restrained, free of jealousy; who has passed a thorough examination, and is grateful – he should be taught the truth.[28]

Therefore he made this known by his own conduct (*anusthāna*). If he had revealed this only by teaching it, people might have thought, "He is only trying to show his own superiority." But when he made this known by his own conduct, it made it easier for them to say, "We also need this," and thus to gain faith and undertake it themselves.

Is it necessary to get [the required] knowledge in this way, by becoming a disciple and learning this mantra ? Aren't the śāstras, the "arts of knowledge,"[29] also ways to acquire learning ? When one studies them, isn't knowledge gained by this method ? Using an analogy, he reveals the difference between knowledge gained from the śāstras and knowledge arising from this mantra.

7. Knowledge arising from all the *śāstras* is like wealth earned by oneself. Konwledge arising from the Tirumantra is like inherited wealth (*paitṛkadhana*).

Knowledge which arises in the cetana from all the śāstras teaching knowledge of reality – *śruti, smṛti,* etc. – is like wealth one earns by oneself. That is, it can be obtained only by strenuous effort. But knowledge which arises from the Tirumantra – through the ācārya's teaching – without effort. As it is said :

> Śāstric knowledge, which is very difficult, is the cause of mental vacillations. After realizing Hari by means of instruction one shoud retire from action.[30]

Thus it has been stated that the Tirumantra, which is a summary of the śāstras, is greater than the śāstras themselves.

That may be so, but let us leave aside the śāstras. This is not the only mantra relating to the Lord. Aren't there many more besides this one? With the intention to explain the excellence of this mantra compared to other mantras, he answers this doubt:

8. The Lord's mantras indeed are many.

> Let the number of your births, precipitated by a flood of your qualities, be as [innumerable] as those qualities.[31]
>
> Many, O King, are the auspicious qualities of your son.[32]
>
> Of your endless qualities, just six are your primary qualities.[33]
>
> O Arjuna, many births have passed for me, as well as for you.[34]
>
> [He is] the one of eternal, immeasurable fame [or, qualities].[35]
>
> You have been born in all kinds of wombs.[36]

As stated in such passages, the Lord's qualities, as well as his *avatāras* which are expressions of his qualities (*guṇaparīvāharūpa*), are innumerable. In the same way, the mantras which are connncted with these are also many, as it is said "The Lord's mantras are many."[37]

But are all [these mantras] in the same category? To this he says :

9. These [mantras] are of two kinds : *vyāpaka* **and** *avyāpaka.*

The two categories [of mantras] are the *vyāpaka* [mantras] which explain the Lord's true nature as the one who pervades all (*sarvavyāpaka*) and the *avyāpaka* [mantras] which explain just one of the qualities or activities pertaining to his *avatāras* [but not his all – pervasiveness].

Are both these categories equivalent ? To this he replies :

10. The three *vyāpaka* **[mantras] are better than those which are** *avyāpaka.*

Better than all the *avyāpaka* mantras are the three *vyāpaka* mantras which are cited in the Viṣṇu Gāyatri, which reads :

> Nārāyaṇāya vidmahe, vāsudevāya dhīmahi, tanno viṣṇuḥ pracodayāt.
>
> May we understand Nārāyaṇa. May we meditate on Vāsudeva. May Viṣṇu inspire that [meditation] for us.

The words "nārāyaṇa," "vāsudeva" and "viṣṇu" in the Viṣṇu Gāyatri are the three primary names for the three mantras [based on each]. Therefore, this [Viṣṇu Gāyatri] suggests the three mantras that are formed by simply joining together [each name] with the Praṇava [the *om*] and the word "namas."

Are all three *vyāpaka* mantras equal ? To this he says :

11. The great Tirumantra is the most important among all these three.

If you consider all three of these *vyāpaka* mantras—which are better than all the *avyāpaka* mantras—the Tirumantra is the most important. It is the first mentioned [in the Viṣṇu Gāyatri], saying "Nārāyaṇāya vidmahe." Furthermore, its meaning is complete. Therefore it is the most important, as stated [in the following passages] :

> No mantra is greater than the eight–syllabled [Tirumantra].[38]
>
> There is none greater than the eight–syllabled [Tirumantra].[39]
>
> Why are the other two *vyāpaka* mantras inferior ? To this he replies :

12. The other two are accepted by the unorthodox *(aśiṣtaparigraha)* **and are incomplete.**

The other *vyāpaka* mantras containing the words "vāsudeva" and "viṣṇu" do not expound the Lord's essential nature, form and qualities, as does the word "nārāyaṇa," but only his essential nature. Therefore many of the short–sighted [Advaitins],[40] who affirm that [Brahman] is merely unqualified intelligence, accept them. Thus they are accepted by the unorthodox. Furthermore, they are incomplete, since they require inferring what it is that [the Lord] pervades, etc.

Āccāṉ Piḷḷai has clearly revealed the incomplete nature of the other two *vyāpaka* mantras and the completeness of the meaning of the Tirumantra :

> The six–syllabled ["om namo viṣṇave"] does not state 1) what it is that [the Lord] pervades *(vyāpyapadārthaṅkaḷ)* [that is, the world of sentient and insentient beings], 2) the method by which he pervades *(vyāpanaprakāra)*, 3) the object or purpose of such pervasion *(vyāptiphala)* [the *śeṣa–śeṣi* relationship], and 4) the qualities of [the Lord] who is the pervader *(vyāpakaṉuṭaiya guṇaṅkaḷ)*. Since it only

states the fact of pervasion, (*vyāpti*) [with the verbal root *viś*–, to pervade], it is incomplete. The twelve-syllabled ["om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya"], though it states the method of pervasion (*vyāpanaprakāra*) [by taking "vāsudeva" to mean "he lives *(vas–)* in each as a god *(deva)*"], lacks words referring to what it is that is pervaded *(vyāpyapadārthaṅkaḷ)*. Even though that can be supplied by inferring the word "sarva—all" (to read "he lives in all—sarvam vasati"), that [word "sarva"] does not include [any reference to the Lord's] qualities. So in order to establish those qualities, the word "bhagavat—having glory" has to be added. Furthermore, it does not state the purpose or result of [the Lord's] pervasion (*vyāptiphala*) [that is, the *śeṣaśeṣibhāva*]. This [Tiru]mantra is not like those, for it shows equally and explicitly : 1) what it is that [the Lord] pervades (*vyāpyapadārthaṅkaḷ*) [that is, the world of sentient and insentient beings, with *nāra*], 2) the result of that pervasion (*vyāptiphala*) [the *śeṣaśesibhāva*, with the fourth case-ending on the word "nārāyaṇa"], and 3) the qualities of the pervader [by interpreting "nārāyaṇa" to mean the locus or abode of the *nāras* who are his attributes.] Thus when compared to the others, [the Tirumantra] is superior on account of the richness of its meaning. [41]

Do the orthodox aceept this [mantra] ? To this he replies :

13 The Vedas, *ṛṣis*, *Āḻvārs*, and *ācāryas* all preferred this one.

In the Viṣṇu Gāyatri, in referring to the three *vyāpaka* mantras, the word "nārāyaṇa" is put first because of its pre-eminence. Ignoring the words "vāsudeva" and "viṣṇu," [the Upaniṣads] indicate the Lord's essential nature, etc., with the word "nārāyaṇa." [This can be seen in the following passages :]

1) The Nārāyaṇa Anuvāka [of the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upanisad*]; the essence of all the Vedāntas, begins "The world is Nārāyaṇa," and says :

> Nārāyaṇa is the supreme Brahman. Nārāyaṇa is the supreme reality. Nārāyaṇa is the supreme light. Nārāyaṇa is the supreme Ātman. Whatever in the world is seen or even heard, within or without, all that Nārāyaṇa has pervaded. [42]

2) The *Mahopaniṣad* says :

> Only the one Nārāyaṇa was there, neither Brahmā nor Īśāna [Śiva] nor earth and sky. [43]

3) The *Subālopaniṣad,* [in the section] beginning with the statement, "The things to be seen and the eye to see are Nārāyaṇa, the things to hear and the ear to hear are Nārāyaṇa," ends with the statement, "The directions (north, east, etc) and the subsidiary directions (northeast, southwest, etc.) are Nārāyaṇa," [44] which also occurs in between.

4) The *[Subālopaniṣad*'s*]* Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa, which begins with "he whose body is the *ātman*, whose body is the earth," ends with "he whose body is death," and states in between :

> The inner soul of all, without any evil or sin, the one divine deity is Nārāyaṇa. [45]

Therefore, the unauthored, eternally flawless and self-authoritative Vedas—ignoring the words "vāsudeva" and "viṣṇu"—have preferred [this name, "nārāyaṇa"] for referring to the Lord's essential nature, etc.

The *ṛṣis*, in their works which elaborate the Vedic truths, have also praised this [mantra] in many places :

> Just as among all gods there is none higher than Nārāyaṇa, so among all mantras there is none higher than the eight-syllabled [Tirumantra]. [46]

> Listen, sons and disciples ! Raising my hands, I solemnly affirm to you here and now : There is no mantra greater than the eight-syllabled [Tirumantra].[47]

> The eight-syllabled [Tirumantra], whose meaning is the essence of all the Vedānta, transporting all across the flood of saṁsāra, is the refuge for men who want no more rebirth. [48]
>
> Those who are distressed, downcast, distraught, afraid, or afflicted with terrible diseases, after reciting merely the word "nārāyaṇa," are released from their trouble and become happy. [49]
>
> The word "nārāyaṇa" is available and the tongue is under their control. Even so, people are falling into the most horrible hell. How surprising ! [50]
>
> What is the use of many mantras ? What is the use of many vows ? The mantra "namo nārāyaṇāya" achieves all aims. [51]

Therefore the great *ṛṣis* such as Vyāsa – who are devoted to clarifying the meaning of the Veda – have preferred [this mantra].

All the Āḻvārs, who understood all things (*samadhigatasamastavastuvāstava*) due to the uncaused grace of the Lord (*nirhetukabhagavatkaṭākṣa*), as stated [in the passage] "the one who was given the gift of illusion – free wisdom,"[52] also preferred [the word "nārāyaṇa" and the Tirumantra, as can be seen below :]

1) Nammāḻvār [in his *Tiruvāymŏḻi*] begins with "Nārāyaṇa of great fame,"[53] and "glorious Nārāyaṇa,"[54] and ends with "Nārāyaṇa of flourishing fame."[55]

2) Pĕriāḻvār begins by saying "so that people of the city and the country will understand the phrase 'namo nārāyaṇa',"[56] and says "Continually I am uttering 'namo nārāyaṇa'.[57]

3) Pĕrumāḷ [Kulaśekhara Āḻvār] begins with "[repeating] the name of Nārāyaṇa as if it is branded on one's tongue,"[58] and ends saying "Nārāyaṇa, resplendent with all auspicious qualities."[59]

4) Tirumalicai Pirāṉ begins, "Nārāyaṇa created the four-faced [Brahmā]"[60] and says, "Those who recite the eight syllables can rule heaven".[61]

5) Tirumaṅkai Āḻvār says, "I have realized the name of Nārāyaṇa,"[62] in the beginning, and then repeats it in the same way nine times. He concludes just as he began, saying "Nārāyaṇa, lustrous as a gem, lying on the serpent couch, please come."[63]

6) The first Āḻvārs say :

With garland in hand, I learned the garland of words, "namo nārāyaṇa."[64]

It is our duty to continually recite "nārāyaṇa."[65]

I have lit the lamp with the good light of wisdom for Nārāyaṇa.[66]

The names of Nārāyaṇa.[67]

Unless I see Nārāyaṇa there is no daylight.[68]

Uttering the name of Nārāyaṇa many times.[69]

Therefore, ignoring the other mantras, they each considered this one to be their refuge. Since the people who have resorted to them, at the time of their instruction, were taught that this [mantra] is the basis for spiritual upliftment (*ujjīvanahetu*), the ācāryas who followed the Āḻvārs also preferred it.

Thus the excellence of this mantra in comparison to other mantras has been stated.

After this, he reveals the excellence this mantra has even in comparison with the one to whom it refers :

14. The excellence of this utterance (*vācaka*) is not like the excellence of its referent (*vācya*).

The greatness of this utterance [the mantra] is not like the greatness of the Lord, the one to whom it refers.

He gives the reason for saying this :

15. Though the Lord remains far away, this stays near and gives help.

Even when the one who is referred to in this [mantra] (*vācya*) is not nearby but far away, this utterance (*vācaka*) remains nearby and faithfully gives what is needed by those who utter it.

Have there been such occasions when this utterance rendered aid while the one to whom it refers was far away ? To this he reveals :

16. In *Draupadī's* distress, it was the holy name that showered her with saris.

When Duśśāsana tried to disrobe her in the great assembly, Draupadī thought of what Śrī Vasiṣṭha had said earlier : "When great danger strikes, Lord Hari should be remembered."[70] So in her extreme distres, Draupadī sought refuge, saying "O Acyuta who lives in Dvārakā, bearing the conch and discus in your hand, O Lotus-eyed Govinda, I seek refuge in you. Protect me !"[71] As [Kṛṣṇa himself] said, "When [Draupadī] called out 'Govinda', I was far away from her."[72] Even though Kṛṣṇa, the one indicated [by the name "Govinda"] was far away, it was that holy name of Govinda itself, referring to that avatāra, which provided her with multiple garments. If we look at what was done by a holy name which refers to but a single part of the meaning of the word "nārāyaṇa," the superior quality of this [mantra] can be deduced by the principle of "how much more" (*kimpunarnyāyasiddha*).[73]

He reveals its excellence by yet another method :

17. If one recites [this mantra], its true nature will not be lost, even if one recites it without [the proper] method.

Unless people have faith in it as a refuge and then recite it, no mantra will do its work. However, this mantra is not like that. Even without the procedure of having faith in it and reciting it, if people merely utter it, "as a nickname, in jest, as an exclamation, or even as a reproach,"[74] its true nature of protecting those who recite it will not be lost.

After this he reveals its superiority in granting all that is desired :

18. This indeed grants all that is desired, as stated [in the hymn beginning] "It provides a noble family..."[75]

This mantra, as the Āḻvār revealed in the hymn beginning "It provides a noble family...," grants all that one desires, according to one's qualification.

He explains this :

19. For those who desire wealth *(aiśvarya)*, **the** *kaivalya* **[form of** *mokṣā*], **or attainment of the Lord** *(bhagavallābha)*, **it will grant these.**

As it is said, "The wealth of this world, otherwordly wealth such as *svarga, kaivalya,* or the Lord - this mantra will enable one to attain them."[76] Thus it grants all these various aims—this-wordly and otherwordly wealth, the *kaivalya* [form of moksa] consisting of attainment of the *ātman*, or attainment of the Lord which is the supreme aim *(paramapuruṣārtha)* to those who desire them. For [this mantra] itself becomes a sādhana when used in sacred utterances, oblations, etc. *(jāpahomādi)*

After this he reveals the Tirumantra's excellence in aiding the other upayas such as *karma, jñāna,* etc.:

20. For those who are involved in *karma, jñāna,* **and** *bhakti,* **it gets rid of obstacles and makes these** (*upāyas*) **succeed.**

For those involved in *karmayoga* and the like, if they take it as an aid in their sacred utterances, oblations, etc., it gets rid of the sin which prevents them from starting *karmayoga* and prevents their rites (*karma*) from being interrupted; in this way it makes them succeed. For those involved in *jñānayoga,* if they take it as an aid in the beginning, it will get rid of obstacles to undertaking *jñāna* (which is to be achieved by *karma*) and causes their knowledge (*jñāna*) to increase day by day, thus making it successful. If it is taken as an aid by those involved in *bhaktiyoga,* it gets rid of the obstacles to beginning *bhaktiyogā,* causes that devotion (*bhakti*) to increase, and thus makes it succeed.

On the other hand, he reveals the excellence of the aid it provides for the *prapanna*.

21. For those involved in prapatti, having given rise to knowledge of the soul's true nature (*svarūpa*), **it becomes a way to pass the time, and a cause for enjoyment.**

This method of prapatti (*prapattyupāya*) is easy and in accord with the soul's true nature (*svarūpa*), not difficult or contrary to that nature like the others stated previously. For those involved in it, the Tirumantra brings about knowledge of the soul's true nature as dependent on the Lord (*bhagavatpāratantrya*), with which that prapatti is in accord. It also provides a way to occupy one's time by meditating on its meaning, as [the Āḻvār] said, "As for me, Viṣṇu's holy name (*tirumāl tirunāmam*) is honey, milk and nectar."[77] Since it is delightful in itself, like the one to whom it refers [Viṣṇu], it is a cause for enjoyment.

After this, he reveals its excellence in explaining all the truths that need to be known :

22. As it is said, "Rather than speaking of other things..."[78] all the truths which must be known are contained in it.

As [the Āḻvār] said, "Rather than speaking of other things, I have learned your eight - syllabled [Tirumantra]." Thus all the special truths which must be known to save the soul are contained in this mantra.

What are these things that have to be known ? To this question he replies :

23. These are five truths (*añcartham*).

This is a reference to the five truths (*arthapañcaka*) : the nature of the soul, the nature of the Lord, the nature of the goal, the nature of the means (upāya), and the nature of the obstacle.

> The nature of Brahman who is to be attained, the inner soul who is to attain him, the means to attain him, the result of attainment, and the obstacles to attainment—of these all the Vedas, Itihāsas and Purāṇas speak, as well as the great-souled sages and learned men who know the Vedas and the Vedic truths. [79]

As the above passage says, all the Vedas and śāstras propound these five truths. Therefore, these same things are also to be propounded by this mantra which summarizes these [Vedas and śāstras]. This mantra must explain 1) the nature of the inner soul by the Praṇava, 2) & 3) the nature of the obstacle and the upāyá by the "namas," 4) the nature of the Supreme [Lord] by the word "nārāyaṇa," and 5) the nature of the goal by its fourth case-ending.

After this he explains the greatness of the mantra's meaning.

24. The previous *ācāryas* thought they had not been born until they learned its meaning. Once they knew its meaning, as it is said, "Once I was truly born, I have not forgotten,"[80] they could not spend their time in any other way but with it.

Our previous ācāryas such as Nāthamuni, Yāmuna, and Rāmānuja (Yativara) considered themselves to be unborn before they learned the meaning of this mantra ; they thought, "At that time, I had not yet been born." Once they had learned its meaning, as in the divine words of the Āḻvār who says "Once I was truly born, I have not forgotten," they did not know any other way to spend their time but with this mantra's meaning. This is because, on account of what the Vedas, śāstras and Āḻvārs said, they were continually reflecting on and being nourished by this mantra's meaning.

Granted that the power of this utterance *(vācaka)* allows anything to be accomplished ; but why should [the ācāryas] have held so firmly to the one to whom this [mantra] refers *(vācya)* ? To this he-replies :

25. The reason for holding more firmly to the one indicated by this utterance *(vācya)* [the Lord] than to this utterance itself *(upāya)* is faith that the Lord alone is the means *(upāya)* and goal *(upeya)*.

Even though the power of this statement itself—which brings results as a sādhana in its own right or as an aid to other sādhanas—is well-established (as stated above), the previous ācaryas held more firmly to the one who is referred to in this mantra than to it. The reason for this is that they reverenced the Lord himself as the means *(upāya)* and goal *(upeya)*. Thus they were not like those who are devoted to other goals, who take this mantra as a sādhana, or like those devoted to other means—who take this mantra as an aid.

Therefore, from the *cūrṇā* beginning "In accord with the greatness of the Tirumantra" (3) to this point [Piḷḷai Lokācārya has revealed :

1) the great worth of this mantra such that it is not proper to utter it casually,

2) its greatness due to the fact that the Lord himself appeared as disciple and ācarya and revealed it,

3) its superiority in comparison to all the śāstras, to all other mantras, and even to one to whom it refers [the Lord],

4) its greatness in granting results even when recited improperly,

5) its magnificence in granting all desired goals,

6) its excellence in aiding the upāyas such as karma[yoga],

7) its loftiness in expounding all the truths to be known,

8) the unique importance of the truths it propounds.

Thus he has demonstrated the excellence of this mantra for all to know.

After this, he reveals that for this mantra, there are two ways to construe its meaning as a whole *(vākyartha)*.

26. The meaning stated in it may be either 1) the ***svarūpa*** **and the goal** ***(prāpya)*** **in accord with the** ***svarūpa*****, or 2) the** ***svarūpa*** **the means*****(upāya)*****, and the result** ***(phala)*****.**

(1) The meaning stated in this mantra may be stated as (a) the soul's essential nature (*svarūpa*) of subservience (*śeṣatva*) and dependence (*pāratantrya*), and (b) the goal (*prāpya*) of service (*kainkarya*) which is in accord with that nature. (2) Alternatively, we may state its meaning as (a) the soul's essential nature (*svarūpa*) of subservience (*śeṣatva*), (b) the means (*upāya*) which is in accord with that nature, and (c) the result (*phala*) which is to be attained by that means.

In the first of these interpretations, the soul's nature is stated by the Praṇava and the "namas", and the goal (*prāpya*) is stated by the word "nārāyaṇa". In the other interpretation, subservience is stated by the Praṇava, the means by the "namas", and the result by the word "nārāyaṇa."

What is this result like ? To this he replies :

27. The nature of the result **(*phala*)** **we have discussed in the** ***Prameyaśekhara*** **and** ***Arccirādigati*****.**

The result to be attained for the soul is going to the supreme heaven (*paramapāda*), fully experiencing the Lord, and performing complete service (*aśeṣaśeṣavṛtti*) inspired by the love arising from that experience. [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says he has explained all this concisely in his book *Prameyaśekhara*, and elaborately in the book *Arccirādigati*, so we can consult these.

After this, with the intention to present the truths explained in this mantra, he first gives the number of syllables and the number of words it has.

28. This [mantra] has eight holy syllables and three words.

As it is said :

> "Om" has one syllable, "namaḥ" has two syllables, and "nārāyaṇāya" has five syllables. This is the eight-syllabled *(aṣṭākṣara)* mantra in Gāyatri meter.[81]

> One should pronounce "om" in the beginning, then "namaḥ," and after that "nārāyṇaya."[82]

Therefore he says it has eight syllables and three words. When referring to its having eight syllables, the *śruti* [cited above] says that the "om" or Praṅava has one syllable, the "namas" has two syllables, and "nārāyṇāya" has five syllables. There are some who separate the word "nāra" from the compound word "nārāyaṇa" to make six syllables [nārāyaṇaya] and claim that it has eight syllables without the Praṇava. But [according to this] that position is not Vedic and ought to be rejected. [83]

What are the meanings of its three words? To this question he replies :

29. The three words state three meanings.

He states these meanings very clearly :

30. These are: subservience (*śeṣatva*), **dependence** (*pāratantrya*), **and service** (*kaiṅkarya*).

The meaning of [this mantra] as a whole *(vākyartha)* was previously said to be the soul's essential nature *(svarūpa)* and the goal *(prāpya)* in accord with such an essential nature. What was said previously [in *cūrṇa* 26] is recalled here.

Which is the first among these three words ? To this he says ·

31. The *Praṇava* is the first word in this [mantra].

Śruti says, " 'Om' should be pronounced in the beginning." [84] In addition, *smṛti* says :

> The Praṇava first, "namah" in the middle, the word "nārāyaṇa" last. One should know this eight-syllabled mantra which can accomplish everything for men. [85]

After this, in order to give the meaning of the 'Praṇava', he states that it is composed of three syllables :

32. This [*Praṇava*] has three syllables : a, u, and m.

This Praṇava, in its expanded form, exhibits three syllables, three words, and three meanings. In its contracted form it exhibits one syllable, one word, and one meaning.

Using an analogy, he reveals how it originally came to have three syllables.

33. These three syllables were obtained from the three Vedas, just as one might churn curds in three pots and collect butter.

As it is said in *śruti* and *smṛti* :

> "Bhūḥ" arose from the Ṛg Veda ; "bhuvaḥ" arose from the Yajur Veda ; "suvaḥ" from the Sāma Veda. These pure ones were melted and from those well-melted three, the three syllables *(varṇa)* were born : *a*, *u*, and *m*. When they were put together that became the Om. [86]

> Prajāpati extracted from the three vedas the *a*, *u*, and *m* and also the "bhūḥ," "bhuvaḥ," and "svaḥ." [87]

Thus the Lord of all brought forth from the three Vedas the three sacred syllables, "bhūrbhuvaḥsuvaḥ." He [melted] them till they flowed like [molten] gold and, by his will, caused the three syllables, *a*, *u*, and *m*, to appear from them. In this way the Lord extracted [them]. With this in mind, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya compares this] to churning curds separately in three pots and put together the butter which is their essence.

He reveals the outcome of this :

34. Therefore, this [*Praṇava*] is the essence of all the Vedas.

Since these three syllables were extracted as the essence of each of the Vedas, the Praṇava which is composed of these three syllables is the essence of all the Vedas.

From [the *cūrṇa*] beginning "The meaning stated in it . . ." (26) up to this point [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has stated :

1) the meaning of this mantra as a whole *(vākyārtha)*,

2) the number of syllables it has,

3) the number of words it has,

4) that these three words explain three meanings,

5) what its first word is,

6) that it contains three syllables,

7) that since these three syllables originated as the essence of the three Vedas, the Praṇava which is composed of them is the essence of all the Vedas.

Now, with the intention to reveal the meaning for these three syllables one by one, he first states the meaning of the letter *a*.

35. The letter *a* is the basis of all speech and is a contraction of the word *nārāyaṇa*. Therefore, here it refers to the Lord who is the cause of the whole world and the savior of all.

The letter *a* is placed first in these three letters. It is said,

> At that time he created the names and forms of creatures and established their various occupations—beginning with the gods—from the words of the Veda. [88]

Thus the Veda was the basis for all the worldly speech. As stated in such passages as, "the Vedas which begin with the Praṇava," [89]

and "the Vedas which arose from the *om*," [90] the Praṇava is the basis for the Vedas. As it is said in the passage, "the one dissolved in the material world," [91] [the Lord] himself is the basis of the Praṇava. It is also said, "The letter *a* is indeed all speech," [92] and "Whereas the nature of the letter *a* is to be the basis of all sounds." [93] Thus [the letter a], the basis for all sound, is accepted as the contraction for the word *nārāyaṇa*, referring to the Lord of all, the savior of all, the one who has all things as his body.

> [He is] the one from whom these creatures are born and because of whom all beings live. [94]
>
> He alone is the one to be created and the one who creates. He indeed is protector, destroyer, and protected. [95]

Such passages declare that Our Lord *(ĕmpĕrumāṉ)* is the cause of the world and protector of all.

Thus this letter *a* refers to 1) [the Lord's] status as cause [of all] which is the stem meaning *(prakṛtyartha)* [of the letter *a*] and 2) his status as a protector which is its root meaning *(dhātvartha)*.[96] Even when it is said that this letter *a* shows protection because it is a contraction of the word *nārāyaṇa*, this can only be claimed by depending on its root meaning.

Just what is this protection ? To this question he replies :

36. Protection means banishing obstacles and granting what is desired.

Being a protector or savior *(rakṣaka)* is twofold : [it means] getting rid of what is not wanted and obtaining what is desired. The Lord's protection of the cetanas means he gets rid of the obstacles that bring them misery and grants the things they desire which bring them happiness.

What are their obstacles that he banishes ? What are these things they desire which he gives ? To this he replies :

37. These two correspond to the particular situation of each *cetana.*

"Correspond to the particular situation of each cetana" means "in accord with their respective qualifications *(adhikāra).*"

He then makes this explicit :

38. For those [involved] in *saṁsāra,* **the obstacle is oppression by enemies, etc.; what they desire is food, drink, etc. For those who want** *mokṣa (mumukṣu),* **the obstacle is attachment to** *saṁsāra;* **what they desire is the supreme heaven** *(paramapada)* **For released souls and those eternally free, the obstacle is loss of service; what they desire is service in abundance** *(kaiṅkaryavṛddhi).*

For those in saṁsāra who are in the habit of thinking of the self as the body and enjoying sense objects (sound, etc.), the obstacles to be averted are things such as suffering at the hand of one's enemies. The things they desire as the goal are things like food and water. When he says "oppression by enemies, etc." the word "etc." [also] refers to suffering caused by such things as mental and physical illness. When he says "food, drink, etc.," the word "etc." also refers to things like flowers, clothes, jewelry, cosmetics, and embracing women.

The phrase beginning "For those who want mokṣa..." means that for the *mumukṣus* who have realized they are scorching in saṁsāra and who desire to go to the supreme heaven *(paramapada)*, the obstacle to be gotten rid of is attachment to saṁsāra – having "false knowledge, wicked charcter, and foul body"[97] the condition of [all] in this [earthly] realm. What they desire as the goal (*prāpya*) is attainment of the supreme heaven which allows them to experience the Lord.

The phrase beginning, "For released souls..." refers to those devoted to service performed out of the love which arises from experiencing the Lord—that is, both those who have left saṁsāra and who have never experienced even a whiff of saṁsāra. For these released and eternally free souls the obstacle is any interruption that

might occur in the service they are performing at the holy feet of the Lord of all – their designated *śeṣī*–in accord with their true nature [as *śeṣas*]. What they desire is to be able to serve more and more. This is what is meant by "service in abundance."

Thus it has been stated that insofor as he gets rid of their obstacles and grants what is desired according to their qualifications, the Lord himself is the protector or savior of all.

Then is the Lord the only one who protects everyone in this way? Aren't there many who have been protecting us in this world – from our mothers and fathers to other deities? To this he replies :

39. We have stated in the *Prapanna Paritrāṇa* that there are no protectors but the Lord.

The Lord himself is an unconditional kinsman who has been watching over us without letting us go for all time. But mothers and fathers, who are conditional kinsmen, and inferior deities are not protectors. [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says he has presented this idea and the reasoning behind it in the book called *Prapanna Paritrāṇa*. So we can refer to it.

After this, he reveals the Lord's position as husband of Śrī, which is implied by the force of this letter's meaning.

40. Since *Pirāṭṭi's* presence is necessary when he protects, his relationship with *Śrī* is also implied here.

It is said :

> Hṛṣīkeśa, along with the compassionate goddess Lakṣmī, is declared to be the savior (*rakṣaka*) in all authoritative texts and in the Vedānta."[98]

Thus when the Lord and savior rescues souls, the presence of the Goddess (*pirāṭṭi*) the mediator (*puruṣakāra*) – is absolutely necessary, for she causes the Lord's mercy to arise, making it so that he will not forsake these cetanas either upon seeing their sins

or out of his own autonomy (*svātantrya*). Therefore, his relationship with Lakṣmī is to be seen as implied in this letter *a* which refers to the one who is the savior or protector. He says "Śrī" and not "Lakṣhmī" in order to show two things : 1) her inseparability from him which makes her serve him eternally, as stated in the definition "*śrī* means to serve," 2) that she is eternally served by the souls, as stated in the definition "*śrī* means to be served."[99]

Hereafter he demonstrates by an authoritative statement that the Lord's relationship with Lakṣmī necessarily appears in this letter *a*.

41. On this there is *Bhagavat Senāpati Miśra's* statement : "If she ever departed from his chest, she would leave this letter.".

In this context there is a statement revealed by Śrī Senāpati Jīyar, who was well-endowed with wisdom ; he said that if it so happened that she—who eternally dwells on his holy chest, saying "I will never leave, even for a moment" [100]—should actually depart from his chest, then she would also leave this letter *a* which refers to him. (If we don't add the word "said", this statement will not be connected with the previous sentence.) [101]

Therefore, since her connection with his holy chest is eternal, it is certain that wherever he appears, sho too will appear. Therefore, just as she is connected to his holy chest, she is also eternally connected with this letter *a* which refers to him.

In order to substantiate this idea, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] uses an analogy to reveal the eternal connection she shares with both with the letter *a*, indicating the Lord, and the letter *m*, referring to the cetana.

42. Like a mother who refuses to leave either her husband's bed or her child's crib, her nature is to remain without leaving either the first or last letters.

As befitting her subservient nature, in order to give him pleasure, a wife does not leave her husband's bed. As approriate to her protective nature, in order to watch over him, a mother

stays by her child's crib. In the same way, Śrī also clings to her delighting and protecting roles as appropriate to her relationship with her husband and children. Thus she remains without leaving either the letter *a* – the first letter which refers to the Lord, her husband – or the letter *m* – the last letter which refers to the cetanas who are her children.

Singling out a particular instance, he gives an example of the preceding:

43. Like Lady *Yaśodhā* who would not leave either *Śrī Nandagopa* or *Kṛṣṇa*.

As stated in the hymn, "Clothes, water. . . ,"[102] Lady Yaśodā (*yaśodhaippirāṭṭi*) would not leave her husband Śrī Nandagopa, in order to delight him in accord with her wifely nature. She would never leave her son Kṛṣṇa, in order to protect him in accord with her motherly nature. Thus she remained between them. In the same way, the Goddess remains without leaving either the Lord or the cetanas indicated by the first and last letters.

This [letter *a*] does not clearly show that [the soul] is subservient to the Goddess as well, rather than being subservient only to the Lord. However, we take it that we are subservient to her, too. Why is that? To this he says:

44. When a man takes a servant, even though the service contract does not specify the wife, service is certainly done for his wife. Like that, we are servants for the Goddess.

When a man takes a servant – such as a man or maidservant – the contract is not written to say it is for his wife, but is written to say it is only for him. Even so, the servant works for his wife. In the same way, even though the letter *a* states only that [the soul] is subservient to the Lord, we are servants for the Goddess.

Appealing to all the previously stated reasons, he concludes that there is no separate existence at any time for the Lord and the Goddess:

45. Therefore, there is no separate existence (*pirittu nilai-yillai*) . . . .

He reveals two examples for this lack of separate existence (*pṛthaksiddhyabhāva*) :

46. . . . like the light and the luminous object, or the flower and the fragrance.

[This means] just as there is no separate existence for the flower and its fragrance. It has been declared that they have no separate existence, like the light and the luminary, in speeches made by both of them [in the *Rāmāyaṇa*], saying, "I am with Rāghava and no other, as rays with the sun,"[103] and "Sītā is with me and no other, like rays with the sun."[104]

> Indeed, a poet who wants to express the richness of the fragrance of the blossoming flower [which gives glory to that flower, describes it as self - given, not as being from something else.][105]

In this verse Bhaṭṭar revealed that the Lord's position is that of a flower and the Goddess is in the position of the fragrance. Thus it is implied that the two have no separate existence, like a flower and its fragrance.

Appealing to this lack of separate existence, he reveals what the cetana's ultimate aim is to be :

47. Therefore, their union is the aim *(uddeśya)*.

By saying "Their union is the aim," he states that desiring each separately is not to be one's aim. If one desires either one of them separately, it will only have unfortunate results, as it did for Rāvaṇa and Śūrpaṇakā.[106] If one resorts to both of them it will be profitable, as it was for Śrī Vibhīṣaṇa.

Further on, in order to reveal the meaning of the case-ending on this letter, he first specifies what that case-ending is :

48. A fourth case–ending is added and dropped.

A fourth [dative] case ending added to this letter *a* has been dropped because of the rule saying that case endings are dropped in a compound.[107]

When all the other case–endings are possible, why is it said that it is a fourth case–ending on this letter ? He voices this doubt, saying :

49. How did a fourth case–ending get added ?

He answers :

50. Because it is a contraction for the word "*nārāyaṇa*."

Since this letter *a* is a contracted form of the word "nārāyaṇa" which is in the fourth [dative] case [in this mantra], it also ends in the fourth case. Otherwise, it cannot be maintained that they are expanded and contracted forms [of the same word].

Just what is the meaning stated by this [fourth case] ? To this he replies :

51. This states [the soul is] a *śeṣa* of the Lord.

Since the fourth [dative] case means "for the purpose of that one," this fourth case states that [the soul is] subservient *(śeṣa)* to the Lord.

Appealing to the common principle that "All dependence on others is painful," and "Service is a dog's job,"[108] people consider subservience *(śeṣatva)* to be painful. [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] voices the question they raise :

52. If it be asked, "Isn't it seen in the world that subservience *(śeṣatva)* is painful?" . . .

He reveals the answer to this :

53. . . . there is no such rule ; for we find that being subservient to a beloved object is pleasurable.

Since we find in the world that according to such passages as "Please command whatever you desire."[109] it is a pleasure to be subservient *(śeṣa)* to a beloved object. Therefore, there is no rule that subservience is painful.

Doesn't the pleasurable nature of subservience to a beloved object also follow on account of the qualities of that object ? To this he says :

54. Since the auspicious qualities (*kalyāṇaguṇa*) **are stated in the letter** *a* **this subservience** (*śeṣatva*) **also comes from [those] qualities.**

In the letter *a*, explaining the Lord's status as savior or protector, the auspicious qualities used in that protection are stated : therefore the subservience directed toward the Lord also follows on account of those qualities. The idea is that for this reason, there is nothing wrong with this [subservience] being pleasurable.

But this conditional *(aupādhika)* subservience [which depends on superficial qualities] can't be inherently natural *(svarūpam)*, can it ? To this he reveals :

55. Subservience (*śeṣatva*) **indeed is the essential nature** (*svarūpa*) **of the soul.**

By stating that the pleasurable nature of subservience toward a beloved object is based on [that object's] qualities or attributes does not mean that here, too, [in the context of subservience to the Lord], it is based merely on such qualities. Rather, if one examines the meaning implied in statements as the following, such subservience is said to be natural (*svābhāvika*) to the soul :

> The soul's nature is to be property : Brahman's nature is to be the owner.[110]

> Always remember the soul's servitude and Hari's inherent ownership.[111]

> All souls are by nature servants to the supreme spirit (*paramātman*). No other definition (*laksaṇa*) applies to them in bondage as well as in moksa.[112]

Therefore, *śeṣatva* indeed is the soul's essential nature (*svarūpa*).

Why emphasize subservience (*śeṣatva*) alone [as the soul's essential nature]? When it is lacking, does the essential nature of soul—who [according to the Upaniṣads] is essentially knowledge and bliss (*jñānānandasvarūpa*)—cease to be?[113] To this he replies :

56 When there is no subservience (*śeṣatva*), **there is no essential nature** (*svarūpa*).

When subservience is lacking, the soul's essential nature is completely destroyed by the notion of autonomy or self-sufficiency (*svātantryabuddhi*) which amounts to theft of the soul (*ātmāpahāra*).

He illustrates this with the next two sentences :

57. Theft of the soul (*ātmāpahāra*) **is thinking [oneself] to be autonomous** (*svatantra*). **When one becomes autonomous, the** (*svarūpa*) **ceases to be.**

> He who thinks the soul to be something other than what it is, what sin has he not committed, this thief who steals the soul[114]

Thus theft of the soul, which is declared to be the root of all sin, means affirming one's essential nature (*svarūpa*) to be autonomous or independent (*svatantra*). And when there is such self-autonomy, the soul's essential nature certainly ceases to be, deseribed as "indeed non-existent."[115] Therefore, there is no problem in saying that when there is no subservience [to the Lord] there is no essential nature [to the soul]. Such is the idea [of this *cūrṇā*.]

Therefore, the letter *a* has been explained to mean : 1) The Lord's position as cause [of the universe], which is the meaning [of the letter *a*] as a [noun] stem, 2) his position as a savior or protector, which is the meaning [of the letter *a*] as a [verbal] root [*av* – to protect], 3) his position as husband of Śrī which is an

implied meaning, and 4) the [Lord's] status as a *śeṣi*, reciprocal to the soul's nature as a *śeṣa*, which is derived from the suffix [the implied fourth case-ending].

He then undertakes to reveal the meaning of the letter *u*, the middle letter :

58. On the strength of its position, the letter *u* means exclusivity.

In such statements as the following, the letter *u* is found to be used in place of the word *eva* [meaning alone, indeed] :

> That alone (*eva*) which was, that alone (*u*) which will be.[116]
>
> That alone (*eva*) is Agni, that is Vāyu, that is Sūrya, that alone (*u*) is Candramā.[117]

Therefore, on the strength of its position, the letter *u* [like the word *eva*] has the meaning of exclusivity.

[A particle] meaning exclusivity can either exclude the substantive from having other qualities *(ayogavyavaccheda)* or exclude those qualities from existing in other substantives *(anyayogavyvaccheda)*.[118] So which is meant in this case ? To this he reveals :

59. This means "subservient *(śesa)* to no other."

This letter *u*, signifying exclusivity, means that the soul, previously stated to be a *śeṣa* of the Lord, is not subservient to any other. Even though subservience to the Lord is explained by the fourth case-ending, is subservience to others possible in this context ? We see in the world that houses, fields, sons and servants which are subservient to one person are also subservient to some others. Thus, might not this kind of subservience to others exist in this context, too ? Since this doubt might arise, the letter *u* [is necessary] to explain that there is no such subservience to others here.

On the other hand, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] states, there are some who claim that subservience to the Goddess is the meaning of the letter *u*.

60. There are those who say that this means "subservient to the Goddess."

> The letter *a* stands for Viṣṇu whose nature is intelligence. The letter *u* is known to stand for Śrī, whose nature is intelligence. But the letter *m* is the servant of both. This is the meaning of the Praṇava.[119]

> Viṣṇu or Hari, the Lord of all the world, is stated by the letter *a*. The letter *u* always means Lakṣmī who is carried by Viṣṇu [on his chest]. But *śruti* affirms that the letter *m*, O Brahmin, stands for the soul which is always subservient to Śrī and Nārāyaṇa.[120]

As stated by such passages in the Lord's śāstras [Pāñcarātra], the letter *a* refers to the Lord, the letter *u* refers to Laksmi, and the letter *m* refers to the soul which is a *śeṣa* of both of them. Thus by taking the letter *u* not to mean exclusivity, but to refer to Lakṣmī, they interpret this letter *u* to mean "subservient to the Goddess."

Nevertheless, he reveals that the first interpretation is primary.

61. Excluding subservience to others is more important than this

Excluding subservience to others—which obstructs the subservience to the Lord stated previously—is considered of primary importance compared to being subservient to the Goddess.

Why is subservience to another so terrible? He answers this with an example of its despicable nature :

62. Making the soul who is a *śeṣa* of the Lord into a *śeṣa* of those in *saṁsāra* is like offering the *Puroḍāśa*, which is a *śeṣa* of the gods, to a dog.

Making the soul who is subservient to the Lord, our rightful *śeṣi*, into a *śeṣa* to those in samsara who are inferior in all respects is like presenting the Puroḍāśa offering—which is so delightful it is fit to be a *śeṣa* of the most honorable gods such as Indra—to a despicable dog !

He reaffirms the previous idea : that excluding this despicable subservience to others is the soul's first priority.

63. Getting rid of subservience to others is even more important than having subservience to the Lord, . . .

Not only is getting rid of subservience to others more important than being subservient to the Goddess, it is even more important for the soul than being subservient to the Lord himself.

He cites the authority for this statement :

64. . . . as it is said, "Men who do not worship anyone else, even if they forget."[121]

In the hymn beginning "Be mindful of this !" Tirumalicai Pirāṉ recounts a conversation between Yama and his servants. When referring to the characteristics of the Lord's devotees *(bhāgavata)* he described them as "men who do not worship anyone else, even if they forget the name of the most holy feet." Thus he says that they are the ones who do not practice subservience toward any other object, even if they forget the holy name of their master (*svāmī*).

He concludes by saying that for the soul who is a *śeṣa* of the Lord, subservience to one's self and subservience to others are both forms of *anyaśeṣatva* – being a *śeṣa* to another; but this letter *u* eliminates them both.

65. This states that [the soul] belongs neither to himself nor to others.

The letter *u* which prohibits subservience to others states 1) that the soul does not belong to himself, since it does not exclude [the soul himself] from among these "others" and (2 the soul does not belong to *saṁsāris* other than himself.

Thus he has presented the letter *a*. After this he presents the letter *m*, the third letter :

66. The letter *m*, being the twenty-fifth letter and denoting knowledge, refers to the soul.

As it is said :

> The [five] elements are the *k* group [*k, kh, g, gh, ṅ*], the sense organs are the *c* group [*c, ch, j, jh, ñ*], the *ṭ* group [*ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, ṇ*] and *t* group [*t, th, d, dh, n*] are the five kinds of sense perception and the five sense objects (smell, taste, etc.). The mind is the *p*, the *ahaṅkāra* is the *ph*, the *b* and the *bh* are the *mahat* and *prakṛti*. The *ātman* is the *m*, known as the twenty-fifth.[122]

Thus the letter *m* is not like the twenty-four letters from *k* to *bh* which refer to the twenty-four *tattvas* of *prakṛti*. It is the twenty-fifth letter which, when conjugated according to the root *man* meaning to think or *manu* meaning to understand,[123] refers to knowledge. Therefore it is the twenty-fifth [principle], as it is said, "The twenty-fifth is *puruṣa*,"[124] and "The *ātman* is the twenty-fifth."[125] The soul is said to have knowledge as its essential nature and knowledge as its attribute :

> The *puruṣa* is composed of knowledge.[126]

> One should know it by its one characteristic of knowledge.[127]

Since the aforementioned subservience is held in common by all three kinds of souls, it is necessary to state that [this refers to] all three. Thus he says :

67. This refers to the entire group.

The letter *m*, representing the soul, thus refers to the entire group of souls.

Can a singular noun refer to a group? To this doubt he replies:

68. This is a singular collective noun.

If a person refers to a mound of grain saying "this grain," he uses a singular noun to refer to a collection. In the same way, this too is a singular noun which refers to the entire group of souls.

To what characteristics possessed by the soul does this letter *m* refer? To this he says:

69. This declares that the soul is a knower (*jñātā*), distinct from the body.

This letter *m*, the twenty-fifth letter representing knowledge, declares that the soul—the locus of subservience—is the one who is the locus of knowledge. Thus this distinguishes the soul from insentient matter.

But the individual soul goes around attributing the notion "I" to the body, saying, "I am a god," "I am a man," "I am fat," "I am thin." So how is it that the soul is distinct from the body? To this he replies:

70. We have stated in the *Tattvaśekhara* how the soul is different from the body.

He says he has established in the book called the *Tattvaśekhara* that, for many reasons, the body is not the soul and is thus different from the soul.

It is proper to state the nature of the substantive *(dharmisvarūpa)* [that is, the soul] before stating the subservience (*śesatva*) which is its attribute (*dharma*). So why is it that in the Praṇava the subservience is referred to first and then the soul ? Regarding this doubt, he gives the reason for stating it in this way.

71. On account of their fragrance and brilliance, flowers and gems are desired. Like that, the soul is respected as a *śeṣa*. Without it – as it is said, "We have no need for our soul" [128]**— [the soul] is to be rejected. To show that, it states subservience [first] and then states the soul.**

Just as flowers are desired as the locus of fragrance, and just as gems are desired as the locus of brilliance, the soul is respected as a locus of subservience. When not a locus of subservience—as stated [in Nammāḷvār's hymn] "We have no need for our soul"—[the soul] can only be rejected, saying "We have no need of a soul lacking subservience to the Lord." To show this kind of subservience, it first states *śeṣatva* and then states the soul.

He gives the ultimate meaning stated by the Praṇava which consists of three words :

72. Thus the *Praṇava* states the relationship between the Lord and the soul, as described [in the hymn] : "I am a servant to the one who dwells in great *Kaṇṇapuram*. Do I belong to anyone else ?" [129]

Tirumaṅkai Āḷvār must have been thinking of the meaning of the Praṇava, for he stated the meaning of the letter *m*, referring to the locus of subservience, when he said, "I am a servant." He stated the meaning of the letter *a*, which has a fourth case ending, when he said "to the one called Lord of Kaṇṇapuram." He was thinking of the letter *u* which excludes subservience to others when he said, "Do I belong to anyone else ?" All that has been said above has declared the *śeṣa* and *śeṣi* relationship which exists between the soul and the Lord, in accord with [the Āḷvār's] glorious hymn.

Then, using the divine hymn of Pöykai [Āḷvār] to show that the recipient of subservience (*śeṣatvapratisambandhi*) is a couple, he explains this relationship between the soul and the Lord.

73. This says, "My mind looks up only to the one consort of the lady on the lotus." [130]

This hymn refers to the husband of Śrī who is the recipient of [the soul's] subservience—as stated in the letter *a*—when it says "consort of the lady on the lotus." It states the soul's devotion to him alone which results from being subservient to no other—as stated by the fourth case-ending and by the letter *u*—when it says "looks up only to the one." It refers to the soul characterized by knowledge — as stated by the letter *m* referring to the locus of *śeṣatvā* — when he says "my mind." Thus this Praṇava states the relationship of the soul and the Lord in accord with this hymn.

Heretofore he has interpreted the meaning of the Praṇava to be primarily the meaning of the [dative case] ending on the letter *a* [that is, the *śeṣa–śeṣi* relationship]. He reveals yet another way to construe the Praṇava which gives primacy to its root meaning [*av*–, to protect].

74. The letter *a* and the letter *m* state the protector and the protected. The fourth case-ending and the letter *u* state the attainment *(prāpti)* [of knowledge of *śesatva*[131]] which is the reason for being protected and the goal.

The letter *a* states the Lord who is the protector. The letter *m* states the soul who is to be saved by him. The fourth case-ending states the attainment [of knowledge] of *śeṣatva* which is the reason for protection. The goal of such protection is the soul being employed for no other purpose than [the Lord's service] Therefore, the letter *u*, referring to subservience to no other, states the goal of salvation. Thus he has revealed the meaning of the Praṇava, the first word in this mantra.

Then, in order to reveal the meaning of the following words, he first shows that the rest of the mantra is an elaboration of this [Praṇava].

75. After this, the *Praṇava* is elaborated *(vivari–)*.

Jīyar [Vādikesari Jīyar] explained in his *Dīpaprakāśa* that,

> Elaboration means first stating the meaning appropriate to the context and then clarifying those previously stated meanings.[132]

In his book which gives the expanded meaning *(vivaraṇakrama)* of the three *rahasyas* he defined elaboration :

> Explaining the stated meaning and revealing further meanings is known by respected people as elaboration (*vivaraṇa*).[133]

He explains how this is an elaboration [of the Praṇava] :

76. The "namas" elaborates the letter *u*. The word "*nārāyaṇa*" elaborates the letter *a*. The fourth case–ending elaborates the letter *m*. So does the word "*nāra*," according to some people.

When excluding subservience to others [the "namas"] clearly excludes oneself as one among these "others" [a meaning implied in the letter *u*]. Therefore the "namas" elaborates the letter *u*.

The word "nārāyaṇa" states clearly 1) the nature of the Lord and protector, 2) the souls and insentient matter which are to be protected, 3) the qualities useful in protecting or saving them, and 4) the method of protection. Thus it elaborates the letter *a*.

The fourth case–ending explains that without doing something (*kiñcitkāra*) subservience cannot be maintained, as it is said : "There is no subservience for one who does not do anything," and "One who does not do anything does not fulfill his subservience (*śesatva*)."[134] Thus the fourth case–ending, which explains what is to be done *(kiñcitkāra)* to allow subservience *(śeṣatva)* to be established elaborates the letter *m* which refers to the soul as the locus of *śeṣatva*.

Some say that the word "nāra" is an elaboration of the letter *m*, because it explains that souls are eternal, have one form, are many in number, etc., as indicated in the letter *m*.

Why is it that, rather elaborating these in the order of the letters [of the Praṇava] they have been elaborated in a different order ? To this he says :

77 This was not explained in order because [the Lord] must be experienced only after the obstacles have been cleared away.

This has not been explained in the order of the letters [of the Praṇava] because one must [first] get rid of the egoism *(ahaṅkāra)*, possessiveness (*mamakāra*), etc. obstructing the experience of the Lord [indicated] in the word "nārāyaṇa" (which elaborates the letter *a*). Then [the Lord] can be experienced.

Next, so as to reveal the meaning of the "namas," the middle word, he states how it is divided into two words.

78. "Namas" is two words—"*na*" and "*maḥ*".

What is the meaning of these two words?

79. The "*maḥ*" says "one belongs to oneself." The "*na*" negates that.

"Maḥ" is a sixth case [genitive] ending on the letter *m*. Thus it shows that the soul indicated by the letter *m* is self-purposed (*svārthatva*), the opposite of the aformentioned quality of being for the purpose of another [the Lord] (*tādarthya*). Therefore it says " one belongs to oneself." The "na," indicating negation, excludes that.

Putting together the meaning stated by both, he says :

80. Thus "*namaḥ*" means "one does not belong to oneself "

Rather than stating the meaning [of "na maḥ"] in the order of the words, it has been stated in reverse order. This is because

one must explain the thing prohibited and then make the prohibition. When said in order, as in "Relinquish everything," [135] it must be composed so as to state the prohibition before the thing prohibited. This [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has also explained in the *Parantapati*.[136]

The letter *u* prohibits subservience to others, saying "one does not belong to oneself or to others." If [this "namas"] elaborates the letter *u*, why has it been explained as saying only "one does not belong to oneself" and not also "one does not belong to others"? To this he says :

81. When one belongs to another [the Lord] can redeem him by demonstrating his own distinctive excellence. When [the cetana] says he is his own, even the possibility [of redemption] is destroyed.

As long as one is a *śeṣa* of another, since he is agreeable to subservience, [the Lord] can redeem him from that state by showing him his own excellence in comparison to others—as the cause of all *(sarvakāraṇa)* the savior of all *(sarvaraksaka)* and the master of all *(sarvaśeṣī)*. But when [the cetana] firmly takes the position that he belongs to himself, if [the Lord] says "You are mine," he will not agree to subservience, but will counter with "I am my own." [137] Thus there will not be even the capacity for redemption.

What is the role played by this "namas" ? To this he says :

82. This gets rid of obstruction

Is this [obstruction] one or many ? He says that the obstructions are three :

83. The obstructions are three.

What are these three ? To this he replies:

84. These are—obstruction to the soul's essential nature (*svarūpa*), obstruction to the means (*upāya*), and obstruction to the goal (*prāpya*).

This refers to 1) obstruction of the soul's true nature referred to in the first word [the Praṇava], 2) obstruction of the means

which is implied in this word ["namas"] and 3) obstruction of the goal stated in the last word ["nārāyaṇāya"]. This "namas," on the analogy of the crow's eyes, [looks in both directions] ; thus it will remove the obstacles to the soul's essential nature *(svarūpa)* and to the goal *(prāpya)*, as stated in the first and last words.[138]

Just what is the removal of these three obstructions ? He reveals this in sequence with the following three sentences.

85. Removal of the obstruction to the soul's true nature is affirming "I am you, what is mine is you."[139] Removal of the obstruction to the means is [having the attitude], "Remove my pain, or don't remove it ! I have no one else to relieve my distress !"[140] Removal of the obstruction to the goal means saying, "Correct all our contrary desires."[141]

The obstruction to the soul's true nature is saying "I am mine." Therefore, removing it means saying, "I am you and what is mine is you," declaring that both self and possessions are [the Lord's] *śesas*, as his attributes. The obstruction to the means is engaging oneself in self-protection. Therefore, removing it means saying, "Remove my pain or don't remove it ! I have no one else to relieve my distress." So, this means declaring "Whether you get rid of my misery or not, I have nothing else as a savior." The obstruction to the goal is the notion of being self-purposed *(svaprayojanabuddhi)*. Therefore, removing it means saying "Correct all our contrary desires"—that is, get rid of any desire we have except to please you.

Thus, the obstruction to all three—*svarūpa*, *upāya*, and *prāpya*—is the soul's egoism and possessiveness (*ahaṅkāra*, *mamakāra*). Therefore he reveals how horrible they are and the benefit to be gained in removing them :

86. "*Maḥ*" **is the destruction of the** *svarūpa*. "*Namaḥ*" **is what uplifts** (*ujjīvana*) **the** *svarūpa*.

> When the cetana has possessiveness toward himself and his own things, then the two syllables "mama" indicate possessiveness.[142]

This says that in this "ma" there is both egoism and possessiveness ; therefore, engaging in it destroys the soul's true nature *(svarūpa)*. Engaging in this "namaḥ," [however], is what uplifts the soul's essential nature *(svarūpa)*. It is also said :

> Two letters spell death ; three letters, the abode of Brahman. The two letters "mama" are death, and "na mama" is eternity. [143]

It is not enough to merely destroy the obstruction to the *svarūpa, upāya,* and *prāpya* ; he says that this "namas" also causes these three—the *svarūpa*, etc.—to shine forth :

87. This displays the soul's true nature (*svarūpa,*) the means (*upāya*), and the goal (*phala*).

He explains this in the following three sentences :

88. "Worshipping [the Lord of] *Tōlaivillimaṅkalam*" [144] states the soul's true nature (*svarūpa*). "Homage to (*namas*) the one who resides on *Veṅkaṭa*" [145] states the means (*upāya*). "[I received] the ultimate worshipping word" [146] states the goal (*prāpya*).

[Nammāḻvār] described the nature of a *śesa* when he went so far as to seek out the holy places beloved by the Lord, as he revealed in [the hymn saying] "worshipping [the Lord of] Tōlaivillimaṅkalam." Here, the word "worshipping" indicates saying "namas." Therefore it states the soul's true nature.

"Homage (*namas*) to the one who resides on Veṅkaṭa" states, "I am a *śeṣa* of the one who owns Tiruveṅkaṭa ; I do not belong to myself." By thus declaring his essential dependence (*svarūpa-pāratantrya*) on [the Lord], without the right to save himself, he establishes that the Lord alone is the upāya. Thus this states the means.

"[I received] the ultimate worshipping word," refers to how, as delight in serving wells up [in the soul], ultimately one has to say "the worshipping word"—that is, the word "namas." Therefore this states the goal.

Subservience to those who belong to the Lord (*tadīyaśeṣatva*) is also to be remembered (*anusandheya*) in the meaning of this word ; therefore [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] states this :

89. Here, subservience to the Lord's devotees ***(bhāgavataśeṣatva)*** **is to be remembered, as in [the hymn] : "If I mingle with anyone, it would be as the slave of your devotees."[147]**

[The Āḻvār says] "I have learned your holy eight letters" thus becoming "the slave of your devotees." This means, "I have learned this from the Tirumantra : service to your devotees." Thus, according to this [hymn], in this word "namas"—which gets rid of egoism and possessiveness and causes subservience to the Lord to shine forth as it truly is—we must also reflect on the subservience to the Lord's devotees which is its grand culmination (*tatkāṣṭhā*).

There are those who say that the subservience to the Lord's devotees, as recalled in the meaning here, is found elsewhere, not [only] in this "namas." Therefore he says :

90. Some say this is in the letter ***a*** **; some say it is in the letter** ***u*****.**

Some people say that since the soul's subservience to the Lord is stated in the fourth case-ending [on the letter *a*], subservience to the Lord's devotees (*bhāgavataśeṣatva*)—which is the culmination of subservience to the Lord *(bhagavatśeṣatva)*—is in the letter *a*. Some say that subservience to no other *(ananyārhaśeṣatva)* culminates in subservience to those who belong to him (*tadīya-śeṣatva*), and therefore it is in the letter *u* which states that [the soul] belongs to no other. Since it is implied in the meaning, it is appropriate that it be stated [here] where the defects [of *ahankāra, mamakāra*] are removed, even if it is also stated in those places.

He reveals the difference between one's attitude before understanding this "namas" and the attitude that arises afterwards :

91. The Lord (*īśvara*) is for himself alone. Insentient [matter (*acit*) is only for others. The soul (*ātman*) is for himself and for others both ; that is the idea [the soul] has held previously. But, contrary to this, the "namas" says "I request you to take me for your own sake, like insentient [matter].

It is said that "Self-autonomy (*svātantrya*) is the essential nature of the Lord." [148] Thus the Lord, whose essential nature is autonomy or self-sufficiency, is one who exists only for his own purposes. The essential nature of insentient matter is dependence (*pāratantrya*), for without any consciousness or intelligence (*caitanyarahita*), it lacks the capacity to think for itself. Therefore, it exists only for the sake of others. The soul has subservience (*śeṣatva*) as stated in the fourth case-ending as well as the capacity for knowledge (*jñātṛtva*) as stated by the letter *m*. Thus it both exists for its own sake by the force of its capacity to know and exists for the sake of another on account of its subservience. But contrary to the idea which has arisen in the word prior to the "namas," this "namas" makes the request to be taken and used for *his* delight, just like insentient matter which exists only for the sake of others. [This is] like [Nammāḻvār's hymn] saying, "Take me for your sake alone." [149]

He explains the statement "for your sake alone".

92. [This means] in the state of enjoyment, when the Lord obliterates [the soul's subservience] not destroying [his pleasure] by thinking one has to guard [one's subservience]. [150]

The Lord—the enjoyer (*bhoktā*)—may come and mingle closely with the soul, as if only accepting service, as [Nammāḻvār described] : "As if he was accepting my service, he entered and consumed me." [151] In that state the Lord may, out of his own infatuation, stoop to have intercourse [with the soul] (*parimāṟi*), completely obliterating the soul's subservient position. When this happens, being used for his delight alone means not destroying the Lord's enjoyment by feeling lowly and withdrawing, saying "I must guard my subservience."

What is the reason why the soul would destroy [the Lord's] pleasure in this way? To this he says:

93. The reason for destroying ' as been stated before and will be stated again later.

The reason why the soul would destroy the Lord's pleasure be feeling lowly and withdrawing when the Lord seizes him and makes use of him has been stated before in the Praṇava, by declaring that subservience alone is the soul's essential nature. Since the fourth case-ending [on the word "nārāyaṇa"] refers to the [soul] as one whose nature is to serve (*kiñkarasvabhāvaṉ*), it also will be stated in the following word.

After this, he reveals by various ways the distinctive excellence of affirming this dependence (*pāratantrya*).

94. When this realization arises, one has done what one ought to do. When this thought is absent, all evil deeds have been done. In this realization, all good deeds are present. Without this, whatever sacrifices (*yajña*) or atoning rites (*prāyaścitta*), etc. one has done are useless. With this [realization], all sins depart and all rewards come about.

"When this realization arises, one has done what one ought to do." This means that when this conviction of one's extreme dependence [on the Lord] (*pāratantryapratipatti*) arises such that one says, "Please take me for yourself alone,"[152] then one has successfully accomplished all that needs to be done to facilitate one's salvation (*hita*).

"When this thought is absent, all evil deeds have been done." This means that when this conviction of dependence is not present, as it is said "What sin has he not committed, the thief who steals the soul [by considering it his own]," all evil deeds will certainly have been done by him.

"In this realization, all good deeds are present." This means that when this is present, the pleasure which would arise to the Lord if one had done all good deeds will flourish. Therefore, in

this affirmation of one's dependence [on the Lord], all good deeds are present.

"Without this, whatever sacrifices or atoning rites, etc. one has done are useless." This means that when this conviction of dependence is lacking, all the sacrifices, etc. that [the cetana] has done in order to please the Lord, as well as all the atoning rites (such as the Kṛcchra and Cāndrāyaṇa) which he has done in order to destroy his sins, will not facilitate either the Lord's pleasure or the removal of his own sins; therefore, they are useless.

"With this [realizaion], all sins depart and all rewards come about." Because of the conviction of one's dependence [on him], the Lord will show abundant favor (*anugraha*) to him ; thereby all sins—which exist in the form of the Lord's disfavor (*nigrahātmakamāṉa sakalapāpaṉkaḷum*)—will depart. As it is said "You are constantly saying 'What can I do ?' for your devotees" [153]; thus the Lord will try over and over again to do something to help the soul. Thereby all rewards will come about, from cessation of saṁsāra to attainment of service.

Thus he has revealed the meaning of the middle word.

After this, he presents the meaning of the word "nārāyaṇa" :

95. "*Nārāyaṇa*" means the abode (*ayana*) of *nāras*.

The word "nārāyaṇa" can be construed in two ways : as a *tatpuruṣa* compound reading "That abode of *nāras* is Nārāyaṇa" or as a *bahuvrīhi* compound, reading "The one whose abode is *nāras* is Nārāyaṇa." [154] Therefore among these two, he first gives the meaning of the *tatpurusa*.

What are these things called *nāras* ? To this he says :

96. "*Nāras*" are the [entire] collection of eternal beings.

The word "nāra," as in *nara*, *nāra*, and *nārāḥ*, is from the root "*ri-*" meaning "to be destroyed." Thus the *ra* refers to things

which are destroyed and the word "na" negates that; [this yields] "nara," indicating the things that are eternal and are not destroyed. The suffix *aṇ* which gives the meaning of a group, lengthens the vowel to yield *nāra,* meaning the group of eternal objects. Because it is in the plural (*nārāḥ*), this means a collection of groups. Thus [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says "the [entire] collection of eternal beings." Here, "eternal" refers to the meaning of the word *nara,* "beings" refers to the meaning of the word *nāra,* and "group" refers to the meaning of the plural form.

What are the things which are like this? To this he says:

97. These are, 1) [his] qualities of knowledge bliss, purity, etc, (*jñānānandāmalatvādi*), 2) knowledge and power, etc. (*jñānaśaktyādi*), 3) affection, affability, etc. (*vātsalyasauśilyādi*), 4) the holy figure (*tirumeṇi*) 5) brilliance, tenderness, etc (*kāntisaukumāryādi*), 6) the divine ornaments (*divyabhūṣaṇa*), 7) the divine weapons (*divyāyudha*), 8) the consorts beginning with the Goddess, 9) the eternally free souls (*nityasūri*), 10) the parasol, whisk, etc. (*chatracāmarādi*) 11) the chief guardians of the holy gates, 12) the leaders of the retinue of gods (*gaṇādhipar*), 13) freed souls (*muktar*), 14) the supreme realm (*paramākāśa*). 15) primordial matter (*prakṛti*), 16) bound souls (*baddhātmākkaḷ*), 17) time, 18) the evolutes [of *prakṛti*] *mahat,* etc., 19) the cosmic eggs, 20) entities such as gods, etc. which are contained in the cosmic eggs.

1) "[The Lord's] qualities of knowledge, bliss, purity, etc. (*jñānāndāmalatvādi*)." These are the qualities which define his essential nature (*svarūpanirūpakadharmaṅkaḷ*), The word "etc." means that they are endless.

2) "Knowledge and power, etc. (*jñānaśaktyādi*)." Knowledge, power, strength (*bala*), lordliness (*aiśvarya*), valor (*vīrya*), splendor (*tejas*) are the six attributes which qualify his essential nature as so defined (*nirūpitasvarūpaviśeṣaṇaṅkaḷ*).

3) "Affection, affability, etc. (*vātsalyasauśīlyādi*)." Affection, affability, lordliness or ownership (*svāmitva*), accessibility (*saulabhya*), etc. refers to the innumberable, special auspicious qualities which derive from those six attributes [above].

4) "The holy figure (*tirumeṉi*)." This is his unique, divine, auspicious body (*asādhāraṇamāṉa divyamaṅgalavigraha*). As it may be singular or plural, this refers to the eternal divine form and other forms that he takes at will. Otherwise, it would not fit with the context which refers to an entire group. This is made clear in the works written by Naṭuviḷtiruvīti Piḷḷai Bhaṭṭar and Āccāṉ Piḷḷai.

5) "Brilliance, tenderness, etc. (*kāntisaukumāryādi*)." This means the beauty, tenderness, fragrance (*saugandhya*), loveliness (*lāvaṇya*), youth (*yauvana*), etc. which are the qualities of that body

6) "The divine ornaments." The innumerable divine ornaments which are worn on that holy body, from the crown to the anklets, as revealed by Rāmānuja.[155]

7) "The divine weapons (*divyāyudha*)." These are the innumerable special weapons such as the conch, discus, mace, sword and bow which are ornamental as well as useful in destroying obstacles for his devotees.

8) "The consorts beginning with the Goddess." As it is said, "Consort of the beloved Śrī and similarly Bhūmi and Nīḷā,"[156] and "Following you, O Goddess, along with Nīḷā, Mahī [Bhumi], are a thousand other goddesses,"[157] these are the Goddess (*pĕriyapirāṭṭi*) [Sri] who is his primary queen, her peers Bhūmi and Nīḷā, and the others who are said to be many. Āccāṉ Piḷḷai described them as "the entire group of queens—Lakṣmī, etc."[158]

9) "The eternally free souls (*nityasūri*)." This means the innumerable host of *suris* including Ananta [śeṣa], Garuḍa, Viṣvaksena, etc.

10) "The parasol, whisk, etc. (*chatracāmarādi*)." These are the parasol, whisk, fan, cup, spittoon, etc. which are used in service.

11) "The chief guardians of the holy gates." These are Caṇḍa, Praçaṇḍa, Bhadra, Subhadra, Jaya, Vijaya, etc.

12) "The leaders of the retinue of gods (*gaṇādhipar*)." These are Kumuda, Kumudākṣa, Puṇḍarīka, Vāmana, Śaṅkukarṇa, Sarvanetra, Sumukha, Supratiṣṭhita, etc.

13) "Freed souls (*muktar*)." These are the ones who say, "We have reached the shore"[159]; that is, the innumerable souls on that shore who, having crossed the ocean of saṁsāra, involved in [doing] all services [for the Lord] on par with the eternally freed souls.

14) "The supreme realm (*paramākāśa*)." The highest heaven (*paramapada*). Since this is composed of five *upaniṣats*[160] it is in the form of a group. Thus there is no problem in counting it [here] as a group. Āccāṉ Piḷḷai has said, "Since it is composed of five *upaniṣats*, Paramapada is also a group."[161]

So from the beginning [of the *cūrṇā*] ("knowledge, bliss, purity, etc.") up to this point he has revealed 1) the attributes which define his essential nature (*svarūpanirūpakadharma*), 2) & 3) the auspicious attributes which qualify his essential nature as so defined (*nirūpitasvarūpaviśesaṇa*), 4) the divine, auspicious body which manifests those qualities, 5) the beauty, etc. which are the attributes of that body, 6) on par with that beauty, the divine ornaments adorning him, 7) the divine weapons which are equivalent to ornaments, 8) the consorts who intimately enjoy all these things, so that the [beauty, etc.] of them all don't go to waste,[162] 9) the eternally free souls who render service in their union, 10) the parasol, etc., which aid their service, 11) the guardians of the holy gates who nervously keep watch lest something happen to the holy couple, 12) the leaders of the retinue of gods, also involved in making auspicious blessings (*maṅgalāśāsana*), who keep watch over the holy armory, 13) the freed souls who, having departed from saṁsāra, render service on the same order with them, and 14) the supreme heaven (*paramapada*) [whose atmosphere] inspires their service. Following, he reveals all the things in the Realm of Sport (*līlāvibhūti*):

15) "Primordial matter (*prakṛti*)." This is the basic *prakṛti* which is a group since it is in the form of three *guṇas*. For this too, Āccāṉ Piḷḷai has revealed, "Basic *prakṛti*, is a group, since it is in the form of a triad of gunas." [163]

16) "Bound souls (*baddhātmākkaḷ*)." These are the souls lying devoid of form within this *prakṛti,* like gold dust imbedded in wax.

17) "Time." A particular kind of insentient matter (*acit*) which is also a group because it is divided into day, night, etc. For this, too, Āccāṉ Piḷḷai has revealed : "Time is also a group, because the divisions of day, night, etc. are many."[164]

Thus up to this point he has stated the things that are eternal by nature. Following, he states the things that are eternal by continuity. Eternality by nature means the lack of origination or destruction in objects which are real. Eternality by continuity means that even though such things are originated and will be destroyed, their name, form, and characteristics have basically remained the same from the beginning of time. Among these are :

18) "The evolutes [of *prakṛti*] *mahat,* etc." These are the [remaining] twenty-three *tattvas* beginning with *mahat* and ending with earth (*pṛthivī*).

19) "The cosmic eggs." These are the thousands and thousands of cosmic eggs, described as "tens of thousands of thousands of cosmic eggs,"[165] which originate from [the evolutes] *mahat,* etc.

20) "Entities such as gods, etc. which are contained in the cosmic eggs." These are gods, men, animals, plants which live in the world egg.

Thus he has revealed the meaning of the word "nāra."

After this, he presents the meaning of the word "ayana."

98. "*ayana*" **means the support or locus** (*āśraya*) **for them.**

Since the word *ayana* means support or locus (*āśraya*), saying that [he is] their *ayana* means [he is] their support or locus.

He presents the meaning of ["nārāyaṇa" as a] *bahuvrīhi* compound :

99. Or else, it may state the one who has them as his locus or support.

If not interpreted as a *tatpuruṣa* compound meaning "the support or locus for them," it may be taken as a *bahuvrīhi*, meaning "the one who has them as his support or locus."

Even if the [Lord's] qualities (*guṇaṅkaḷ*) are referred to when stating "the support or locus for them," when it says "the one who has them as a locus or support," it must be taken without his qualities. [Otherwise] then it is said that those qualities are [the things] to be pervaded (*vyāpya*) the problems of being their own locus or support (*ātmāśraya*) and infinite regression (*anavasthā*) will ensue.

> "When the Lord pervades his qualities, he must pervade them as one qualified by attributes (*guṇa-viśiṣṭaṉāy*), for there is no such thing as something devoid of attributes " In that case, it will end up that the qualities to be pervaded (*vyāpyaguṇaṅkaḷe*) are the same qualities of the one pervading (*vyāpakaguṇ-aṅkaḷe*) and that the qualities of the pervader are the same qualities to be pervaded. Therefore, the problem (*prasaṅga*) results that [these qualities] are their own locus or support (*ātmāśraya*).[166] Moreover, if you maintain that the qualified one (*guṇī*) pervades with his own qualities, you have to say that the qualified one (*guṇī*) pervades his own qualities, then the qualified one has to pervade the qualities which are a locus or support for him (*tadāśraya*). Then the qualified one has to pervade the qualities of the one pervading (*vyāpakaṉ*). Therefore, an infinite regression will result. [167]

This Āccāṉ Piḷḷai clearly revealed.

He presents the outcome of these two compounds.

100 What results from these two is [the Lord's] supremacy (*paratva*) and accessibility (*saulabhya*) . . .

From these two [phrases]—"the support for *nāras*" and "the one who has *nāras* for his support"—the meaning that results is

1) his supremacy (*paratva*) in being the support (*ādhāra*) for all things other than himself, and 2) his accessibility (*saulabhya*) in which the very one who is [their] support in this way enters into all sentient and insentient [beings] and resides there.

He presents the outcome of these two compounds in yet another way.

101. . . . or, [the Lord's] status as the inner controller *(antaryāmī)*, **means** *(upāya)*, **and goal** *(upeya)*.

What results from the two compounds—*bahuvrīhi* and *tatpurusa*—may be [interpreted as follows] : 1) [His] status as the inner controller (*antaryāmī*)— that is, as the controller situated in the inner soul of all sentient and insentient beings, as stated in the Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa [168] 2) [His status as the means (*upāya*) and goal (*upeya*), which is shown in the instrumental and passive formation of the word *ayana*—whose root is either *i*—, "to go," or *ay*—, "to go."[169]

When interpeting the *bahuvrīhi*, it is appropriate to the context to take the word "nāra" as referring to things other than [the Lord's] qualities. Similarly, in interpreting the *tatpuruṣa*, when he takes the word "ayana" to mean the *upāya* and *upeya*, the word "nāra" must be taken as referring to sentient beings and not insentient. This meaning is stated in such passages as [the following]

> Nāras are interpreted to be the collection of all persons. Nārāyaṇa is known by them as their way and support. [170]

> It is proclaimed by the wise that the collection of souls [is referred to] by the word *nāra*. Here "nārāyaṇa" is said because he is their support (*ayana*). [171]

Since [the Lord's] status as the goal (*prāpya*), as derived from the passive conjugation, is without limitation [the Lord must be taken as] qualified by all modes. Furthermore, attaining a

close relationship with the Lord (*bandhulābha*) is also the goal (*prāpya*). Therefore, the Lord exists in all kinds of relationships [with the soul]. He reveals that this is stated in this word.

102. The [hymn] "My Lord, father," [172] **states that the Lord is related [to the soul] in all ways.**

Tirumaṅkai Āḷvār, contemplating the meaning of the word "nārāyaṇa," said, "My Lord, father . . . " Therefore, the Lord indeed exists in all types of relationships with these souls. This is stated in this word.

Being related [to souls] in such a manner, what does he do for us ? To this he says :

103 Even when we are for others, he is for us.

Even at the times when we sever our relationship with him and become benefactors to others, he remains as our benefactor.

If he is so [devoted] to us even when we are devoted to others, just what is it that he is doing ? To this he says :

104. Like those who feed [their proud children] in a public shelter at night, he lies hiding within, keeping watch over [our] very existence. [173]

[There are some people] who, out of false pride, won't directly come to [their parents] and get what they need to live. But [these parents] won't let them perish with hunger. Therefore they feed them at night in a public shelter so that they won't find out [that it is their parents who are giving them food]. In the same way, these cetanas who won't bow their head to the Lord remain apart, exercising their autonomy. So the Lord, becoming their internal soul, hides himself within such that they don't perceive him and goes on protecting their very existence, etc.

Thus he has revealed that this word "nārāyaṇa" means the Lord who is the recipient of service.

After this, he reveals that its case-ending explains the prayer for service.

105. This "*-āya*" makes the request to do all services, as stated [in the hymn], "[*Anantaśeṣa*] becomes an umbrella when he moves about."[174]

This fourth case ending, "-āya," makes the request to do all kinds of service like the blessed Ananta Āḻvāṉ [Anantaśeṣa, Viṣṇu's serpent] as stated in the hymn, "[Anantaśeṣa] becomes an umbrella when he moves about."

Some people say, "But since the "namas" states [the soul's] extreme dependence (*atyantapāratantrya*) which negates the right (*prāpti*) to desire anything for oneself, desiring and requesting this service itself is inappropriate." He raises their question :

106. [If] the "namas" negates any attachment for oneself [in service], then is it fitting to pray for service ? If this be asked . . .

He gives the answer to this :

107. The prayer for service is not imposed from without (*vanteṟi*) ; it results from [the soul's] essential nature (*svarūpa-prayukta*), as it is said, "Lying as your doorstep, may I look up to see your coral mouth."[175]

"Lying as your doorstep, may I look up to see your coral mouth" ; such a prayer for service (*kainkaryaprārthanā*) is stated with extreme dependence (*atyantapāratantrya.*) Thus the prayer for service is not something resulting from egoism in the form of self-enjoyment (*svabhoktṛtvarūpāhankāra*)—which would therefore be imposed from outside. Rather, it comes right from the soul's true nature (*svarūpa*) [as a dependent *śeṣa*], which is such that [the *svarūpa*] cannot support itself without glorifying the *śeṣī*.

Based on what he has already stated, he explains how the prayer for service is made known in the fourth case-ending :

108. Therefore, this demonstrates the prayer, "May we render flawless service."[176]

Since the prayer for service is not imposed from without but a result of the [soul's] essential nature, this fourth case-ending demonstrates the prayer, "May we render flawless service," meaning "We request to do all services such that there are no gaps or mistakes in our service."

After this, he reveals the nature of those who have a desire for the object to be attained such that they conduct this prayer for service incessantly.

109. As it is said, "Will there be any sleep for the eyes of those who have such love that they can't stop gazing, filling their eyes [with the Lord],"[177] there will be no sleep till they see him: If they see him, since "[The wise ones] always see,"[178] there will be no sleep.

"Will there be any sleep for the eyes of those who have such love that they can't stop gazing, filling their eyes with the eternal Māl (Viṣṇu), surrounded and worshipped by the hosts of unblinking ones"[179] This says, will there be sleep for the eyes of those who are established in such love that they can't stop till they have filled their eyes with the Lord who is continually experienced by the host of the eternally free souls (*nityasūrikaḷ*) ? As this states, there is no sleep (in the form of contracted consciousness) until they see that object [the Lord]. Upon seeing [him], as it is said "[The wise ones] always see," there will be no sleep, for they will be continually experiencing [him].

He reveals that for yet another reason [the soul] won't get any sleep :

110. For one who laments the lost time, saying "Many days have passed in vain,"[180] there is no sleep.

"I have seen him on his couch, and have worshipped the feet of that one with red eyes, the one who is the color of dense waves. I weep with grief, saying 'Many days have passed in

vain." This states how one cries out in pain, saying, "Upon seeing and experiencing this object [the Lord], [I realize that] so much time has passed in vain which should have been used for this kind of experience." For one who so laments his past days, there is no way for sleep to come in his remaining days.

Furthermore, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] convinces us that those who have realized this [Lord] won't forget him.

111. They say, "Then I was not born. Once I was truly born, I have not forgotten."[181]

"In order to reach me, the Lord was standing, sitting and lying in the holy shrines. At that time I had not been born as one who has attained birth in the form of wisdom. Once that knowledge arose, I have never forgotten him." This is what they say. So, since this is the state of those in whom knowledge of the superior excellence of the goal has arisen, the prayer for service will be continual. That is the idea.

After this, he reveals that this service (*kaiṅkarya*) is without restriction to time and place.

112. As **it is said "Being close to him for all time, without any break, [may we render flawless service],"**[182] **this service is to be carried out in all places, at all times, and under all conditions.**

This service which is the ultimate aim (*puruṣārtha*) in keeping with the soul's true nature is described as, "being close to him for all time, without any break," meaning that we will be with him at all times without interruption and in all places, not leaving under any circumstances. Thus this says it is to be conducted in all places. at all times, and under all conditions.

When a wife wears the *maṅgalasūtra* it shows that she belongs to none other than her husband. In the same way, bearing the Tirumantra shows that the cetana belongs to none other than the Lord. To explain this idea he describes this [Tirumantra] as a kind of *maṅgalasūtra* :

113. The Tirumantram is like a *maṅgalasūtra*[183] which has eight threads [woven into] three strands.

Unlike the ordinary *maṅgalasūtra* which has sixteen threads and two strands, the Tirumantra—which has eight holy syllables and three words—is like a *maṅgalasūtra* with eight threads and three strands.

What is indicated by describing it in this way?" To this he says :

114. This means that the Lord will protect the soul as a husband (*pati*).[184]

Calling this [Tirumantra] a *maṅgalasūtra* states that the Lord will be a husband [or master, lord, protector—*pati*] for the soul embellished with it and will protect him.

Then he concludes by summarizing the meaning explained by this mantra :

115 Thus [the Tirumantra] has said : "I belong to Our Lord (*ĕmpĕrumāṉ*) alone. May I not belong to myself at all. May I be allowed to do all services to *Nārāyaṇa*, the *śeṣī* of all."

The word "thus" shows that he is summarizing all that has been revealed in detail heretofore.

"I belong to Our Lord alone." Here he states 1) the meaning of the first letter [of the Praṇava, *a*] which has a fourth case-ending by saying "to Our Lord," 2) the meaning of the middle letter [*u*] by the particle of exclusion ["alone"], 3) the meaning of the third letter [*m*] by saying, "I belong to." Thus he has summarized the first word.

"May I not belong to myself at all." Here he states 1) the meaning of the syllable "maḥ" which ends in the sixth case by saying "belong to myself," 2) the meaning of the syllable "na" by saying "not. . . at all," and 3) that this is to be requested by the cetana, with the words "may I." Thus he has summarized the meaning of the middle word.

"May I be allowed to do all services to Nārāyaṇa, the *śeṣī* of all." Here, "to Nārāyaṇa who is the *śeṣī* of all" states the recipient of service as well as the fourth case–ending showing the prayer for service. "May I be allowed to do all services" states the method of praying for service.

"[The Tirumantra] has said" means that these things have been stated. He thus summarizes again what he has revealed elaborately in order for everyone to know and contemplate this meaning of the Tirumantra. Therefore everyone should always meditate on this meaning.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. In this work, the word "soul" will often be used to translate the synonymous terms *ātmā, cetana,* and *jīva.* In keeping with the text I have used the masculine personal pronouns (he/him/his) to represent these words, rather than the neuter pronouns. This sounds awkward in English, where we are used to referring to the soul as "it." But to represent the soul as an impersonal entity would be contrary to the text and to Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta philosophy, where the soul is indeed the only personal aspect of an individual, all else being insentient matter *(prakṛti, acit).*

2. "Asanneva." *Taittīrīya Upaniṣad* 2. 6. in *Upaniṣat - Saṅgrahah,* ed. J. L. Shastri (Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1984). Hereafter abbreviated *US.*

3. A *muktakaśloka* attributed to Kūrattāḻvāṉ, disciple of Rāmānuja, traditionally recited by both Tĕṉkalai and Vaṭakalai schools before the reading of the *Nālāyira Divya Prabandham.* See introductory pages of edition by K. Venkataswami Reddiyar (Madras : Tiruveṅkaṭattāṉ Tirumaṉṟam, 1981). Hereafter abbreviated *NDP.*

4. This passage articulates the Tĕṉkalai view that those who realize *kaivalya,* solitary enjoyment of the *ātman* alone, achieve a permanent but inferior state of *mokṣa,* without the presence of the Lord and the joy of serving him, which is the soul's true destiny. The Vaṭakalai accept the existence of *kaivalya* but don't consider it a permanent or "dead-end" mokṣa. From there one can go on to attain the Lord.

5. Sanskrit śloka, source unknown,

6. Parāśara Bhaṭṭar's *Aṣṭaśloki 4.* See Appendix I.

7. *Vṛddhahārīta Smṛti* 6. 48. In *Smṛti Samuccāya,* ed. and pub. by Hari Narayana Apte (Poona : Ānandāśrama Press, 1905). Hereafter abbreviated *SS.*

8. Tirumaṅkai Āḻvār's *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 8. 10. 3, *NDP* : "I am not associated with those who accept other gods. It is fitting for me to be a slave of your slaves. Rather than speaking of other things, I have learned your eight - syllabled [Tirumantra], O Lord who dwells in Kaṇṇapuram."

9. Attributed to *Nāradīyakalpam,* Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā 1. 11.

10. Attributed to *Śeṣasaṁhitā* 14. 50

11. Attributed to *Vihaghendra Saṁhitā,* Paṭalam 22.

12. Attributed to *Viṣṇutattvam.*

13. Attributed to *Hārīta Smṛti.*

14. *Mahānārāyaṇa Upanisad* 11. 1, *US.*

15. Attributed to *Viṣṇutattvam.*

16. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 6.6.2, *NDP.*

17. The anonymous *Jitante Stotra* 1.4, *SM.*

18. Internal in origin *(ādhyātmika)*, from deities *(ādhidaivika)*, and from animate beings *(ādhibautika)*.

19. "The nature of Brahman who is to be attained, the inner soul who is to attain him, the means to attain him, the result of attainment, and also the obstacles to attainment—of these, all the Vedas, Itihāsas, and Purāṇas speak, as well as the great-souled sages and learned men who know the Vedas and the Vedic truths" Attributed to *Hārīta Smṛti* 8.141.

20. *Lakṣmī Tantra*, ed. B. Krishnamacharya (Madras : Adyar Library, 1959) 17.71.

21. *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā*, ed. M. D. Ramanujacharya (Madras . Adyar Library, 1966) 14.28b–29a.

22. *Jitante Stotra* 1.4, *SM*.

23. Attributed to *Viṣṇudharma* 1.59.

24. *Përiya Tirumoḻi* 10.6.1, *NDP*.

25. *Ārti*, literally "pain," has the special meaning in Śrīvaiṣṇavism of being restless to get out of saṁsāra. (See glossary, Appendix III.)

26. Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

27. Attributed to *Jayasaṁhitā*.

28. Vedānta Deśika's *Nyāsaviṁśati* 3. See *Nyaasa Viṁśati*, with, meaning and commentary in English by D. Ramaswamy Ayyangar (Madras : Viśishṭādvaita Prachāriṇī Sabhā, 1979).

29. Nammālvār's *Tiruvāymöḻi* 1.9.8, in *Bhagavad Visayam*, ed. and publ. by P. B. Annangaracharya, 5 vols. (Kanchi: 1975–6) and in *NDP*. Hereafter abbreviated *TVM*.

30. Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

31. Paraśara Bhaṭṭar's *Raṅgarājastava* 2.74, *SM*.

32. *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, critical edition by G. H. Bhatt, et. al. (Baroda : Oriental Institute, 1960–75) 2.2.18. Hereafter abbreviated *Rā*.

33. Attributed to *Viṣṇudharma*.

34. *Bhagavad Gītā* 4.5. In *Bhagavad Gītā* with Rāmānuja's *[Gītā]bhāṣya* and Vedānta Deśika's *Tātpāryacandrikā*, ed. and publ. by U. T. Vıraraghavacharya (Madras : 1972). Hereafter abbreviated *BhG*.

35. *TVM* 3.3.3.

36. *Tiruviruttam* 1, *NDP*,

37. Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

38. Attributed to *Nāradīyam*, Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā 1.41.

39. *Narasiṁha Purāṇa*, ed. Uddhavacarya (Bombay : Gopala Narayan Co., 1911) 18.32.

40. The term *kudṛṣṭin*, one who is short-sighted or ill-sighted, is often used by Viśiṣṭādvaitins to refer to the Advaitins.

41. Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Parantarahasya*. In *Parantarahasya* and *Māṇikkamālai*, ed. P. B. Annangaracharya (Madras and Kanchi : Sat Grantha Prakāśana Sabhā, 1949) p. 3.

42. *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, Kaṇḍa 11, *US*.

43. *Mahopanisad* 1, *US*.

44. *Subālopaniṣad* 6, *US*.

45. *Subālopaniṣad* 8, *US*.

46. Attributed to *Nāradiyakalpam*, Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā 1.41.

47. *Narasiṁha Purāṇa* 18.32.

48. Attributed to *Nāradiyakalpam*, Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā 1.41.

49. A śloka used to conclude recitation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāma*. See *Śrī Vishṇu Sahasranāma* with the Bhāṣya of Śrī Parāśara Bhaṭṭar, tr. A. Srinivasa Raghavan (Madras : Viśishṭādvaita Prachāriṇi Sabhā, 1983) p. 800.

50. *Garuḍa Purāṇa* (Delhi : Nag Publishers, 1984) 1.228.9.

51. Attributed to *Nāradiyakalpam,* Aṣṭākṣara Brahmavidyā 1.40.

52. *TVM* 1.1.1.

53. *TVM* 1.2.10.

54. *TVM* 1.10.8.

55. *TVM* 10.9.1.

56· *Tiruppallāṇṭu* 4, *NDP.*

57. *Përiyāḻvār Tirumöḻi* 5.1.3, *NDP.*

58. *Përumāḷ Tirumöḻi* 2.4, *NDP.*

59. *Përumāḷ Tirumöḻi* 10.11, *NDP.*

60. *Nāṉmukaṉ Tiruvantāti* 1, *NDP.*

61. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 77, *NDP.*

62. *Përiya Tirumöḻi* 1.1.1, *NDP.*

63 *Ciṟiya Tirumaṭal* 50, *NDP.*

64. Pöykai Āḻvār's *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 57, *NDP.*

65. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 95, *NDP.*

66. Pūtam Āḻvār's *Iraṇṭām Tiruvantāti* 1, *NDP.*

67. *Iraṇṭām Tiruvantāti* 2, *NDP.*

68. *Iraṇṭam Tiruvantāti* 81, *NDP.*

69. Pey Āḷvār's *Mūṉṟam Tiruvantāti* 8, *NDP*.

70. A variant reading in the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*, found in 2.548.2. Edited Vishnu S. Sukthankar, et. al, 19 vols. (Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1927 – 66). Hereafter abbreviated *Mbh.*

71. Attributed to *Mahābhārata*, but not found in critical edition (*Mbh*). Appears in 2. 90. 43 of southern recension, ed. T. R. Krishnacharya and T. R. Vyasacharya (Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1906)

72. Attributed to *Mahābhārata*, but not found in the critical edition. Appears in 5. 47. 39 of the southern recension, ed., T. R. Krishnacharya.

73. *Kimpunarnyāya*, the principle of "how much more" or "it goes without saying." That is, when we see how the mere name of Govinda – which is not as great as the name of Nārāyaṇa—protected Draupadī, how much more should the name of Nārāyaṇa protect one.

74. *Bhāgavata Purāna* (Bombay : Śrī Veṅkateśvara Steam Press, 1914) 6. 2. 14 : "Wise men know that saying 'Vaikuṇṭha' as a nickname, in jest, as an exclamation, or even as a reproach, will remove all sins."

75. *Pěriya Tirumŏḻi* 1. 1. 9, *NDP* : "I have realized the name of Nārāyaṇa which will give all good things. It provides a noble family and wealth. All the distress etc. of its devotees it will remove. It grants heaven and the whole world. It provides strength and anything else. It is a greater benefactor than one's own mother."

76. *Vṛddhahārīta Smṛti* 6. 50, *SS*.

77. *Pěriya Tirumŏḻi* 6. 10. 6. *NDP*.

78. *Pěriya Tirumŏḻi* 8. 10. 3, *NDP*.

79. Attributed to *Hārītasmṛti* 8. 141.

80. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 64. "My Lord is standing in Ūraka [Trivikrama temple in Kanchi]. My Lord is sitting in Pāṭakam [temple in Kanchi]. My Lord is reclining In Tiruvehkā. Till I realized that, then I was not born. Once I was truly born, I have not forgotten. For now he is standing, sitting, and reclining in my heart."

81. All but the last sentence found in *Nārāyaṇātharvaśira Upaniṣad* 3, *US*.

82. *ibid.*, immediately preceding the previous passage.

83. Vedānta Deśika, in chapter 27 of his *Rahasyatrayasāra,* quotes with favor a passage from the *Nāradīyam* or *Nāradīya-kalpam* (which Maṇavāḷamāmuni has also been citing) which suggests this way of construing the Tirumantra as having eight syllables without the Praṇava, thus making it suitable for women and *śūdras*. He favors, however, another passage from the same work which says that women and *śūdras* should be given only "namo nārāyaṇa," minus both the Praṇava and the fourth case-ending. The Tēṉkalai ācāryas do not hesitate to give the full Tirumantra, with the Praṇava, even to women and *śūdras*. See *Śrīmad Rahasyatrayasāra*, edited and published with commentary by U. T. Viraraghava-charya (Madras : 1980) 27 : pp. 822–24 (hereafter abbreviated *RTS*).

84. *Nārāyaṇātharvaśira Upaniṣad* 3, *US*.

85. Source unknown.

86. *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* of the *Atharvaveda* (Calcutta : Narayana Press, 1891) 1.1.6.

87. *Manusmṛti* with Kullūkabhaṭṭar's commentary (Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1909), 2.76.

88. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* [*Śrīviṣṇupurāṇam*], ed. P. B. Annangaracharya (Kanchipuram : Granthamālā Kāryālaya, 1972) 1.5.63.

89. Attributed to *Laghvatri Smṛti* 1.9.

90. Attributed to *Viṣṇudharma* 67.6.

91. *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 9.8, *US* : "That sound pronounced in the beginning of the Veda, which is well established in the Vedānta, [that *om*] is the one dissolved in the material world (*prakṛti*), that is the Supreme Lord."

92. Attributed to *Garuḍa Purāṇa*.

93. Attributed to *Vāmana Purāṇa*.

94. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 3.1, *US*.

95. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 1.2.70.

96. When taken as a noun stem, *a* means causation, since the *a* is the basis or cause of all speech. When taken as a verbal root (*av*–), then the meaning is protection.

97. Nammāḻvār's *Tiruviruttam* 1, *NDP*.

98. *Lakṣmī Tantra* 28.14.

99. Both verb forms, active and passive, are derived from the same root, *śri*–.

100. *TVM* 6.10.10.

101. The text of the *cūrṇā* is lacking the Tamil word *eṉṟu* (lit. "said") to make it clear that its latter sentence is a quotation introduced by the first sentence.

102. *Tiruppāvai* 17, *NDP* : "Wake up, Nanda Gopāla, who provides clothes, water, and food to the needy ! Wake up, Lady Yasodhā, woman like a tender vine, shining light of the royal house ! Wake up, O Lord of the other world, who measured the entire cosmos, piercing through infinite space!" The point of citing this hymn is to show how she is addressed in between Nanda and Kṛṣṇa.

103. *Rā* 5.21.15.

104. *Rā* 6.106.17.

105. Parāśara Bhaṭṭar's *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* 29, *SM.*

106. In the *Rāmāyaṇa,* the demon Rāvaṇa wanted Sītā for himself, and was eventally slain. His sister Śūrpaṇakā lusted after Rāma, and for that reason was disfigured. Rāvaṇa's brother Vibhīṣaṇa, however, first sought Sītā's blessing, then left Rāvaṇa and took refuge with Rāma. He was spared.

107. Pāninī's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 7.1.38.

108. *Manusmṛti* 4.160 and 4.6, respectively. Also quoted by Rāmānuja in his *Vedārtha Saṅgraha,* ed. and trans. S. S. Raghavachar (Mysore : Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, 1978) no. 244.

109. *TVM* 4.1.5 : "Those who enjoy the nectar of sweet union with ladies of beautiful, soft hair on lovely, cool, wide beds of flowers, tell them 'Please command whatever you desire.' But if these men become [so poor that] they don't have enough cloth to cover the front of their bodies, the same ladies and even poor people will ridicule them. Why not live by reciting the name of our Māyaṉ [Kṛṣṇa], whose body shines like a sapphire ?"

110. Attributed to *Visṇutattvam.*

111. Attributed to *Viṣṇut ttvam.*

112. Attributed to *Hārīta Smṛti.*

113. Vedānta Deśika takes issue with this very point. Technically, he says, the soul's *svarūpā* is *jñāna, ānanda,* etc. according to *śruti* and to the *Brahma Sūtras.* Though *śeṣatva* is an important characteristic, since it implies a relationship it can't be a description of the essential nature of the soul itself (*RTS* ch. 5 : pp. 142–7). It is an exaggeration, he says, to say that lack of subservience destroys the soul's *svarūpa,* because that is inherently eternal (*RTS* ch 24 : p. 704).

Both sides of the dispute can quote Rāmānuja. For in his *Vedārtha Saṅgraha* Rāmānuja says that the soul has "subservience to the Supreme as its *svarūpa*" (no. 246), whereas in his *Śrībhāṣya* he describes the soul's *svarūpa* in terms of *jñāna* and *ānanda* (*BS* 2.3.27–30, 1.1.1).

114. *Mbh* 1.68.26.

115. "Asanneva," *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.6, *US*.

116. *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 1.2, *US*.

117. *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 1.7, *US*.

118. There are two ways to use particles of exclusion. If we say "The lotus is only red," we mean the lotus has the quality of redness and not other opposing qualities such as blueness or yellowness. This is *ayogavyavaccheda*. If we said, "The lotus alone is red," this would mean that only the lotus has the quality of redness, and no other objects in question possess that quality. This is *anyayogavyavaccheda*. Normally, word order in Sanskrit would determine which form of exclusion is meant, but in a compound there might be some confusion. Here the *u* in the Praṇava is said to represent *ayogavyavaccheda*, meaning the soul is subservient to none other than the Lord (though other things, such as insentient matter and the divine attributes, are also the Lord's *śeṣas*.).

119. Source unknown.

120. Source unknown.

121. *Nāṉmukaṉ Tiruvantāti* 68, *NDP* : "Be mindful of this ! Men who do not worship anyone else, even if they forget the name of the most holy feet, you must reverence as saints and then depart from them !". Thus declares Yama, calling his messengers to hear."

122. Attributed to *Pādmottara Purāṇa* 254.25–27.

123. The root *man* – can be conjugated by the 8th (*manute*) or 4th (*manvate*) conjugations. Though often used interchangeably, traditional grammarians recognize an original difference in meaning, the former meaning "to understand" the latter "to think."

124. Source unknown.

125. Attributed to *Yajur Veda Aṣṭakam* 1. 2. 47.

126. *Praśna Upaniṣad* 4. 9. *US.*

127. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4. 5. 15, *US.*

128. *TVM* 4. 8. 10.

129. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 8. 9. 3, *NDP.*

130. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 67, *NDP*: "The flowing river looks only to the sea. The beautiful flower looks only to the rising sun. The soul looks up only at [the Lord of] *dharma* (Yama). My mind looks up only to the one consort of the lady on the lotus."

131. The phrase "rakṣaṇahetuvāṉa prāpti (the attainment which is the cause of protection)" has been rendered "rakṣikkaikku hetuvāṉa śeṣatvamākiṟa prāpti (the attainment which is *śesatva*, the cause of protection)" by Maṇavāḷamāmuni. Since *śeṣatva* is inherent, and not something to be attained, what must be meant is knowledge or understanding of śeṣatva, which is to be attained by the soul before protection can take place.

132. Attributed to Vādikeśari Jīyar's *Dīpaprakāśa.*

133. Attributed to Vādikeśari Jīyar's *Vādikeśarikārikā*, also called *Rahasyatrayārthavivaraṇam.*

134. "Nākiñcitkurvataḥ śeṣatvam" and "Akiñcitkarasya seṣatva anupapattiḥ." Attributed to Mīmāṁsā.

135. *TVM* 1.2.1.

136. See *Parantapaṭi* in *Aṣṭādaśa Rahasyam* of Piḷḷai Lokācārya, ed. Ayodhyā Rāmānuja Jīyar (Madras : K. V. Tirukkaccinambi Dāsa, 1911) p. 105, *ADR*. Not an exact quotation· (Hereafter, *Aṣṭādaśa Rahasyam* will be abbreviated *ADR*.)

137. From a *muktaka śloka* attributed to Parāśara Bhaṭṭar, in the form of a dialogue between the Lord and the soul :

L — You are mine. S — I am my own.
L — On what basis ? S — And on what basis [is your own position] ?
L — By the authority of the Veda.
S — And [my position] is based on experience from time immemorial.
L — But that has been refuted.
S — Where is this refutation ? Whose is it ?
L — Mine, laid down in the *Gītā*, etc.
S — Who is the witness in this matter ?
L — A learned man will be [the witness].
S — Alas, he will be partial to your side.

Thus, in this quarrel, [Lord], you are in search of an arbiter.

138. According to Indian folk belief, the crow has only one eyeball which it shifts from side to side to look in each direction. This analogy illustrates how the 'namas,' which removes obstacles, can look toward the Praṇava which teaches the nature of the *svarūpa*, or the "nārāyaṇāya" which refers to the goal (*prāpya*)

139. *TVM* 2. 9. 9.

140. *TVM* 5. 8. 8.

141. *Tiruppāvai* 29, *NDP*.

142. *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā* 52. 25.

143. *Mbh* 12. 13. 4.

144. *TVM* 6. 5. 1. This begins a decade where friends of the heroine (traditionally understood to represent Nammāḻvār himself) are addressing the mother, telling her that her daughter has been lost to the Lord of Tölaivillimaṅkalam : "Oh mother, there's no hope for your daughter, for she is worshipping the Lord of Tölaivillimaṅkalam, that city of tall buildings studded with flawless gems. Tears are flowing from your daughter's water–lily eyes and she is torn with grief, sighing 'O one who bears the white conch and discus ! O one with wide lotus eyes !.'"

145. *TVM* 3. 3. 6. "Those who bear it as their duty to pay homage (lit., say "namas") to the one who resides on Veṅkaṭa will have their sins burnt and their bodily karma destroyed. Thus they are doing only good things for themselves."

146. *TVM* 10. 8. 7. "After such enjoyment, what can heaven offer ? Exulting in the loftiest service, I received the ultimate worshipping word. [The commentaries take this to be "namas"]. Upon seeing and enjoying the Lord of Tirupper, he won't depart from my eyes."

147. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 8. 10. 3, *NDP*. "I will not keep company with those who say there are other gods. If I mingle with anyone, it would be as the slave of your devotees. Rather than speak of all else, I have learned your holy eight letters, O Lord of Kaṇṇapuram."

148. "Svarūpam svātantryam bhagavataḥ," *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* 28, *SM*. (Cited out of context; the verse says that the Lord's essential nature of autonomy comes from Śrī.)

149. *TVM* 2. 9. 4.

150. The *cūrṇa* is so cryptic as to be quite unintelligible without the commentary.

151. *TVM* 9. 6. 7.

152. *TVM* 2. 9. 4.

153. *Përiya Tiruvantāti* 53, *NDP*.

154. In a *tatpuruṣa* or determinative compound, the latter member is modified by the former member, as in the word "tatpuruṣa" itself—meaning "his man." A *bahuvrīhi* or attributive compound as a whole refers to an entity different from either of its members, as the word "bahuvrīhi" itself—literally, "much grain"—meaning "one who has much grain (a rich person).

155. In his *Śrīvaikuṇṭhagadya*, *SM* p. 14. See also introduction to the *Gītābhāṣya (BhG)*.

156. Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, *SM* p. 10.

157. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* 26, *SM*.

158. Përiyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Parantarahasya*, p. 16.

159. *TVM* 8.3.10.

160. In *Paramasaṁhitā* 2:30 the supreme heaven (*paramapada*) is said to be composed of five *śaktis*, called *upaniṣats*: *parameṣṭhī*, *pumān*, *viśva*, *nivṛtti*, *sarva*. See *Paramasaṁhitā*, ed. & trans. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar (Baroda : Gaekwad Oriental Series, 1940).

161. *Parantarahasya* p. 16.

162. Literally, so that these ornaments, etc. "don't become moonlight shining in the forest" ; that is, so that their enjoyable qualities are not wasted, with no audience. Maṇavāḷamāmuni is borrowing this image from Përiyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Parantarahasya* p. 16.

163. *Parantarahasya* p. 16.

164. *Parantarahasya* p. 16.

165. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 2. 7. 7.

166. The *ātmāśraya* fault obtains as follows: If the qualified Lord pervades the same qualities which qualify him, this amounts to saying the qualities qualify themselves—that is, they are their own locus or support. Put another way, the statement "Viṣṇu pervades his qualities" would then be a tautalogy, since Viṣṇu and his qualities would be logically coextensive.

167. Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's *Parantarahasya* pp. 16—17. The fault of *anavasthā* or infinite regression obtains as follows: If it is argued that the Lord—the locus or support for his qualities—pervades his qualities with his qualities, this amounts to saying that the qualities are the locus for the Lord. Then which will be the locus for which—the Lord for the qualities or the qualities for the Lord?

168. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 7. 1—23.

169. That is, in the instrumental meaning of "going", he is the one who causes the soul to go to the ultimate goal—the *upāya*. In the passive meaning, he is the one to whom the soul goes—the *upeya*.

170. Attributed to *Pādmottara Purāṇa* 254.52.

171. Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

172. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 1. 1. 6, *NDP.* "My Lord, father, all my kinsmen, my king, my life, the one who defeated and killed the demons with his arrow, the one who resides in Tañcaimāmaṇikkoyil which is surrounded by lush gardens of fresh flowers and waterfalls—upon worshipping him, O believers, I found the name "Nārāyaṇa" to uplift our souls."

173. This analogy, here referred to very cryptically, would be familiar to a Śrīvaiṣṇava audience of the time, for it is used by Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai in his commentary on *Tiruppāvai* 5, and by Vaṭakkutiruvīti Piḷḷai (Piḷḷai Lokācārya's father,

recorder of the *Īṭu*) commenting on *TVM* 1. 1. 5. In both places it is used to bring out how the Lord, as *antaryāmi*, remains within our souls and in the other deities we worship for material needs, thereby looking out for our welfare, even when we ignore him or worship other gods.

174. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 53, *NDP*: "For the Lord, Anantaśeṣa becomes an umbrella when he moves about, a throne when he sits, sandals when he stands, his couch when he goes to the deep ocean, a lamp with the jewels [on his hood], a garment of soft silk, and a bed."

175. *Pĕrumāḷ Tirumŏḻi* 4.9, *NDP.*

176. *TVM* 3.3.1.

177. *Tiruviruttam* 97, *NDP.*

178. "The wise ones *(sūri)* always see the highest abode of Viṣṇu." *Ṛg Veda* 1.22.20.

179. *Tiruviruttam* 97, *NDP.* Maṇavāḷamāmuni, fallowing Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's commentary, takes "imaiyorkaḷ—unblinking ones" to refer to the *nityasūris*. See *Tiruviruttam* of Nammāḻvār with Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's commentary (Madras: Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Mudrāpaka Sabhā, 1903).

180. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 16, *NDP.* Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary quotes most of the verse, but rearranges the phrases.

181. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 64.

182. *TVM* 3.3.1.

183. According to Hindu custom in South India, married women wear a special cord around their neck, the *maṅgalasūtra*, to show their married status.

184. The Sanskrit word *pati* means husband, master, or lord, and connotes being the ruler and protector.

DVAYAM

After giving us the meaning of the Tirumantra, the primary mantra, he reveals the meaning of the Dvayam, which clearly explains the means and the goal *(upāya, upeya)* indicated by the middle and third words of the Tirumantra. In three books that he wrote earlier [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] presented the Caramaśloka after the Tirumantra, and then the Dvayam. Why does he now put the Dvayam before [the Caramaśloka]? The reason is that both ways are accepted. Āccāṉ Piḷḷai, Jīyar, [1] and others also used this order.

What is the reasoning behind these two different orders? Putting the Caramaśloka before the Dvayam gives it the form of "injunction and then practice"; it is appropriate to state rule or injunction before articulating the practice. Furthermore, this method would explain: 1) the Tirumantra which deals with the goal *(prāpya)*, 2) the Caramaśloka which deals with the means *(prāpaka)*, and 3) the Dvayam which explains how to practice both *[prāpya* and *prāpaka]*. Stating the Dvayam before the Caramaśloka is done because the two sentences of the Dvayam explain the middle and third words of the Tirumantra while the two main points of the Caramaśloka explain the meaning of the Dvayam. Thus there is nothing wrong with doing it either way. Since he had presented them using one method in three works already, here he thought he would present them in the other order. Thus he gives the meaning of the Dvayam right after presenting the meaning of the Tirumantra.

To begin with, in one easily understood *cūrṇa*, he presents the things which are considered absolutely necessary in order for one who has become a Vaiṣṇava to maintain his qualification :

116. The following are considered necessary requirements for the *Vaiṣṇava adhikāri* ; 1) relinquishing external attachments, along with all tendencies 2) resorting to Our Lord alone as one's refuge, 3) having confidence that the final reward will not fail to come about, 4) eagerness *(tvarikkai)* for attainment, 5) spending one's remaining days in holy places, enjoying the Lord's qualities and serving him *(guṇānubhavakaiṅkarya)*, 6) rejoicing in the superiority of the *Śrīvaiṣṇavas* who are doing the same, 7) strictly following the Tirumantra and Dvayam, 8) staunch in one's love for the *ācārya*, 9) being grateful to both the Lord and the *ācārya*, 10) living with a good and holy person who has wisdom, detachment, and serenity.

1) "Relinquishing external attachments, along with all tendencies" means relinquishing all attachments to external things, as stated in the passage "father, mother, wives . . .,"[2] along with all tendencies *(vāsanā)* so that they won't tempt one again.

2) "Resorting to Our Lord as one's refuge," means accepting only the Lord of all—the unconditional savior *(nirupādhikarakṣakaṉ)*—as one's refuge, such that one doesn't even entertain the thougt of anyone else being a refuge. These two sentences can be taken as giving the meaning of the first sentence of the Caramaśloka. This is because "relinquishing external attachments" explains the meaning of "sarvadharmān," "relinquishing along with all traces" explains the meaning of "parityajya," "Our Lord" explains the meaning of "mām", "alone" explains the meaning of "ekam," "as a refuge" explains the meaning of "śaraṇam," and "resorting" explains the meaning of "vraja."

3) "Having confidence that the final reward will not fail to come about." This means having faith that final attainment will result without fail, free of any doubts that might arise from thinking about the paltryness of the upaya *(upāyaphalgutva)*, the difficulty of obtaining the goal *(uddeśyadurlabhatva)*, or the enormity of the sins one has committed *(svakṛtadoṣabhuyastva)*.

4) "Eagerness for attainment" means that when one has this faith, one does not merely say, "I'll just wait till I finally realize it." Rather, this means being so impatient that one cannot wait to reach it, as stated in the following verses.

> My mind is only thinking of when I will see great Vaikuṇtha.[3]

> When will the time come when I am called to those great lotus feet that stretched out to take over the entire world ?"[4]

Thus these two sentences state the great faith in one's final reward and impatience for it which are necessary to qualify one for the means and the goal *(upāyopeyādhikārāpekṣita)*.

5) "Spending one's remaining days in holy places, enjoying the Lord's qualities and serving him." This means that even though one is impatient for the goal of reaching the supreme abode *(paramapada)* and doing service there while enjoying the Lord's qualities, one spends his time for the days that he remains in the body eagerly making pilgrimages to the divine places called "your beloved places"[5]—holy sites which the Lord of all has blessed with his presence. With an intense attachment to such holy shrines as "Tirukkaṇṭiyūr, Srirangam, Tirumĕyyam, Kanchipuram, Tiruppernagar, Mahābalipuram"[6], he should spend his time enjoying the auspicious qualities of the one who resides there and, inspired by that, serving him with mind, body, and speech.

6) "Rejoicing in the superiority of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas who are doing the same." This means that if one meets Śrivaiṣṇavas who are endowed with all the aforementioned characteristics, one will recognize their greatness, saying, "In the entire realm of saṁsāra these are as rare as lotuses blossoming out of a burning log," and will therefore become associated with them. Even if one has all the aforementioned qualities, it is rare to have this quality.

7) "Strictly following the Tirumantra and Dvayam." This means being firmly established in the Tirumantra, which clearly proclaims what is to be accepted and what is to be rejected, and

in the Dvayam, which further explains its meaning—without approaching any other mantra even by mistake.

8) "Staunch in one's love for the ācārya" means having overwhelming love for the ācārya, as referred to [in the Upaniṣad]: "One who has supreme devotion to God, and to his guru as to God."[7] For it is the ācārya who, through his teaching, brings about for you all the aforementioned qualities.

9) "Being grateful to both the Lord and the ācārya" means having gratitude toward the correcting and reforming ācārya who, like one who turns iron into gold, has turned you—one who has been eternally bound in saṁsara *(nityasaṁsāri)*—into one fit to attain the status of the eternally freed souls *(nityasūri)*. Likewise it means having gratitude toward the Lord who has been fostering your spiritual inclinations *(adveṣa)* and has joined you with the ācārya.

10) "Living with a good and holy person who has wisdom, detachment, and serenity" means living with a Bhāgavata who is very devout. That person must first of all possess a true knowledge of reality such that even if he is confused, those around him will have no confusion when they look to him, and to be able to foster the aforementioned characteristic in you. He must also be free of any passion for what is improper and have a serenity which is devoid of any pride in possessing the previous [two qualities].

All these are things that the *adhikāri* who has become a Vaiṣṇava must possess. He further presents the specific things on which such a person should meditate :

117. This *adhikāri* should meditate on the three rahasyas.

This *adhikāri* meaning the one who has the aforementioned characteristics, needs to use the three rahasyas which foster that kind of knowledge and practice as an object of meditation *(anusandhāna)*.

After this, in order to proclaim the power of the truths stated in the Dvayam, he first presents the methods taught in the śāstras, Tirumantra, and Caramaśloka ; then he presents this [power of the Dvayam].

118. In all the scriptures *(pramāṇa)*, **attainment [of salvation] is said to be gained by the body. In the Tirumantra, it is said to be gained by the** *ātman*. **In the** *Caramaśloka,* **it is said to be gained by the Lord. In the Dvayam, attainment is said to be gained only by the Goddess** *(pĕriyapirāṭṭiyār)*.

In all the śāstras which deal with the external or physical entity *(viśistaveṣa)*, it is said that attainment of the individual's aim *(puruṣārtha)* is gained only through the body which is able to perform sādhanas. In the Tirumantra which deals with the real form of the soul *(niskṛstaveṣa)*, it is said that the goal *(purusārtha)* is gained only by the soul *(ātman)* who relinquishes his own activity which has been hindering the Lord's protectiveness ; this is because the Lord's status as a protector or savior will not be maintained unless the soul desists from his own self-protection. In the Caramaśloka, which points to the Lord's autonomy, it is said that the goal *(puruṣārtha)* is attained only by the Lord who considers the soul's acceptance to be superfluous. It is the Lord who takes him in hand, removes all the sins which obstruct his attainment, and joins the soul to his holy feet. In the Dvayam which deals with the Lord's form as qualified by Lakṣmī, it is said that the goal is attained only by the great Goddess herself, who is the Lord's distinctive attribute *(viśeṣaṇa)*.

If the Lord is the upāya, how is it that attainment can be from her ? He answers this doubt :

119. "Attainment is gained only by the Goddess"—this means that the Lord won't act without her as a mediator *(puruṣakāra)*.

Even though the Lord is the one who both causes the desired end to be attained and gets rid of what is not desired, [it can be said] that the soul's attainment comes about only by means of the Goddess. This points to the fact that the Lord will not save unless she intercedes so that he will ignore the soul's sins and protect him.

Heretofore he has stated the general requirements of the Vaiṣṇava *adhikāri*. Now he reveals the requirements of the *adhikāri* for the Dvayam in particular.

120. One qualified for the Dvayam is one who has helplessness *(ākiñcanya)* and lack of any other recourse *(ananyagatitva)*.

One qualified for the Dvayam, which affirms the choosing of the accomplished means (*siddhopāya*) [the Lord himself], is one who has both helplessness (*ākiñcanya*) and lack of any other recourse (*ananyagatitva*), as stated in the following passages :

I am helpless, with no way—you alone be my upāya. [8]

O savior, I am helpless, without any other recourse. [9]

I, your slave, without any refuge. [10]

He explains just what the nature of these two are :

121. We dealt with these two in the *Prapanna Paritrāṇa*.

Ākiñcanya or helplessness means not having any other upāya ; *ananyagatitva* means not having any other protector. He says he has clearly explained these in the *Prapanna Paritrāṇa*, so we can refer to them there. [11]

After this, he reveals the meaning of the Dvayam's sentences :

122. With its first part, one goes through *(munnittu)* the Goddess and resorts to the Lord's feet as the *upāya*. With its second part, one requests service in their union.

With the first part of the Dvayam one first goes to the Goddess saying "śrīmad" : then, referring to the Lord's holy feet with "nārāyaṇa caraṇau," one takes them as a refuge, saying "śaraṇam prapadye." With the last part of the Dvayam, one refers to the union of the Goddess and the Lord saying "śrīmate" and requests service to them with the word "nārāyaṇāya" (which

has a dative case ending). Since the word "namas" affirms the destruction of obstacles to service, requesting service is implied therein.

Then, with the intention to reveal the meaning word by word, he begins by presenting the meaning of "śrīmat" :

123. "*Śrī*" is the holy name of the Goddess *(pĕriyapirāttiyār)*.

The word *śrī* is used in the world as a term for wealth, etc. ; so in order to distinguish it from that, he says this word "śrī" is the holy name of the Goddess. Thus "Lakṣmī, Padmālayā, Padmā, Kamalā, Śrī, Haripriyā"[12] are all synonyms for her holy hame. But this one, unlike all her other names, is her primary name, as it is said, "Śrī is the primary name of Lakṣmī."[13] Just as the letter *a* is the primary name of the Lord, as it is said, "*A* is the primary name of Lord Nārāyaṇa,"[14] this is her primary name. That [letter *a*] states those qualities of his which are unique to his function as a protector. This [name "Śrī"] states her qualities which are unique to her function as a mediator.

After this, before giving the meaning of this word "śrī", he presents the two ways of deriving it.

124. "*Śrīyate* (she is served, is depended on), *śrayate* (she serves depends on).

He uses the passive as well as the active voice to conjugate the root *śrī*, which means service, to get "śrīyate" and "śrayate" as the meaning for "Śrī".

He reveals the meaning for these two derivations :

125. The meaning is : Everyone gains their true nature (*svarūpalābha*) by resorting to her ; she gains her true nature by resorting to the Lord.

"Śrīyate—she is served, depends on" means that since she is to be served by all, all cetanas gain their true nature of subservience (*śeṣatva*) by resorting to or depending on her. "Śrayate—she serves, depends on" means that since she serves the Lord, she gains her

true nature by resorting to or depending on him. She is an eternal *śeṣī* with regard to souls and an eternal *śeṣa* with regard to the Lord. Thus she is eternally both to be served and to serve.

Just as the Lord is both the means and the end (*upāya*, *upeya*) she is also both the mediator and the goal (*puruṣakāra, prāpya*). As to which is referred to here, he states :

126 Here she is referred to as the mediator (*puruṣakāra*).

By saying "as the mediator", he rejects the argument which says that she is also to be included in the upāya due to her status as an attribute of the one who is the upāya [the Lord].[15]

As long as one knows the inherent relationship [between the Lord and souls] which is in keeping with the Lord's status as the abode or resting place of all creatures (*nāra-ayana*), why is it necessary for the cetana who is resorting to him to first go to her ? To this he replies :

127 If, like stirring up fire in water, anger should spring up in [the Lord's]. cooled mind due to [the soul's] sins, it is for her sake that he will forgive.

The Lord's holy mind has been pacified and cooled by his special qualities of friendliness to all beings (*sarvabhūtasuhṛttva*) and equanimity as a refuge for all (*samāśrayaṇīyatve samatva*), as it is said : "I am friendly to all creatures,"[16] and "I am the same to all beings."[17]

It is said, "Sometimes the Lord—who is continually kindly—becomes angered at people who are full of sins."[18] In that way, like stirring up an unapproachable fire in cold water, anger may arise in the Lord because of the excessive sins the cetana has committed; thus he may say, "I reject him"[19] or "I won't forgive."[20] If so, it is only for the sake of Lakṣmī that he will forgive. For it is she who cuts off his anger with her words of advice, saying such things as, "What is this ? Who in the world is faultless ?"[21] Thus she causes his compassion to arise. For

this reason, even one who knows of his inherent relationship [with the Lord] will be afraid on account of his sins; therefore he needs to go through a mediator.

He reveals that she alone is a flawless mediator for both sides, taking the responsibility for the work [of saving the soul] on the one hand, and pacifying *(vaśikari-)* [the Lord] on the other hand.

128. She is their mother, unable to bear their distress She is his wife and sweetheart. Therefore she is a flawless mediator.

She is the mother of the cetanas, as stated in the passages saying "You are the mother of all the world."[22] and "Mother of all creation."[23] Because of her relationship with them, if she sees souls who are suffering, she cannot bear it. Indeed, "If her own children go crying, the mother cannot tolerate it."[24] She is his wife, described as "wife of Viṣṇu."[25] She is his beloved, and he is so infatuated with her that when he sees her indescribable beauty, he does what she says, [for he is] "mad for the woman on the cool lotus."[26] Thus she is a flawless mediator.

All this not withstanding, it is the Lord of unconstrained autonomy who is the one who cuts off, roots out, and expiates the cetanas' sins. So is it really she who causes him to forgive ? To this he says :

129. There is no need to say that she who made *Hanumān* become tolerant will make the one who does what she says forgive.

The strong-willed Hanumān was eager to inflict severe punishment, after adding up the sins of the Rākṣasis who had threatened and derided [Sītā, the Goddess] for ten months. But she was the one who made him accept and be tolerant with them by counselling him, saying such things as "Who is angry ?"[27] and "There is none who has not done anything wrong."[28] [The Lord] is described as :

The one on whose chest dwells the lotus lady. [29]

> The one who enjoys the fragrant glances of the maiden on the great lotus.[30]
>
> [The Lord is] overcome with pleasure from his union with the daughter on the lotus flower [31]

Thus he is completely overwhelmed by her physical beauty. Even when she told him to follow the magic deer, Rāma did as she said and went after it, unmindful of the consequences, as it is said, "Rāma, following his love for you, seized his bow and left."[32] So, how much more fitting is it to say that she can make him forgive !

[Piḷḷai Lokācārya's] younger brother [Aḷakiyamaṇavāḷa Pĕrumāḷ Nāyaṉār] has revealed the same thing :

> As it is said, "There is no way to repay the help you have given,"[33] Hanumān risked his life for both her and Rāma. Yet she opposed him, so that Hanumān had to do what she said. The Lord is the one who yields to her delightfulness, as it is said, "She embraces him."[34] He becomes so intoxicated that he [gives up] saying, "What can I do?" Described as, "following his love for you,"[35] and "the one who follows after it,"[36] he yields to her smile, regardless of the consequences. Is it necessary to say that she can make him forgive ?[37]

Thus he has heretofore presented the [meaning] of the stem [*śrī*] of the word "śrīmat." After this, he presents the [meaning] of the suffix.

130. The suffix "mat" states that their union is eternal.

Since this suffix "mat" is the "mat" that means eternal union, this says that the union of these two—the Goddess who is the mediator and the Lord—exists forever.

He demonstrates that their union is eternal :

131. Only in conjunction with her does the subject [the Lord] exist.

The Lord's property of being the husband of Śrī is stated before the attributes of knowledge, bliss, etc., which describe his essential nature *(svarūpanirūpaka)* in the following passage :

> Husband of Śrī, opposed to all that is evil, the locus of all that is auspicious, whose sole nature is eternal knowledge and bliss, distinct from all things other than himself. [38]

Therefore, since this is the primary designation of his essential nature, it is only in conjunction with her that the subject [the Lord] truly exists.

Thus he has revealed that their eternal union results from their relationship being a property of [the Lord's] essential nature (*svarūpānubandhitvaprayukta*). After this he reveals that their eternal union is [also] a result of her qualities.

132. Seeing the Lord's autonomy and the cetana's sins, she doesn't want to leave.

She sees the autonomy of the Lord who adds up [each soul's] sins by the score and metes out punishment. She sees the cetana's sins of omission and commission, which are so many that they "can't be destored even after a million lives of Brahmā"[39] That is, even if [the cetana] endured the entire expanse of time it would be impossible to reach the end of them. Thus, fearful of what may happen, she does not leave the Lord even for a moment.

He explains how this benefits the cetana :

133. The cetana doesn't need to be afraid, thinking of these two.

Since she stays and watches [over him] the cetana, when he thinks of these two things—the Lord's autonomy and his own sins, need not fear what might happen.

After this, he presents the esseential meaning of the suffix :

134. This means that for resorting [to the Lord] only the desire is necessary; there is no need to be mindful of the time.

This suffix, indicating in this way the eternal union of the mediator and the upāya, means that for one who takes refuge with [the Lord], only the desire to do so is necessary. It is not necessary to wait for an [appropriate] time to take refuge, thinking that one can only do so when they are united.

After this, in order to make known that her mediation is absolutely necessary, he explains the difference between her presence and absence :

135. In her presence, the crow was saved, In her absence, *Rāvaṇa* perished.

"The Goddess whose form is compassion,"[40] exists as if mercy itself had taken form. She is the one who subjugates the autonomy of the independent Lord and arouses his compassion The crow [Kākāsura] had committed a heinous crime and was about to be beheaded by the Brahmāstra. But [Sīta, the Goddess] was present, and so his neck was saved when she took pity on him; thus he was "protected by her mercy."[41] Rāvaṇa was in a similar state—helplessly trapped—but because she was not present, even though he had not inflicted any [physical] harm [to Sītā] like the crow, he perished as the target of Rāma's arrows. Therefore her presence is necessary for those resorting [to the Lord]. Thus he has revealed the meaning of the word "śrīmat."

After this, he reveals the meaning of the word "nārāyaṇa" :

136. The word "*nārāyaṇa*" states the qualities that come forth if the Lord's autonomy is subdued through mediation.

With her words of advice and her beauty, [the Goddess] is perfectly capable of winning over *(vaśīkari-)* [the Lord] and achieving her goal. The Lord had been angered upon seeing the sins committed since time immemorial by the cetana who is seeking refuge. But as a result of this mediation alone, he will now accept him. The word "nārāyaṇa" refers to [the Lord's]

qualities which, though they haven't appeared prior to this, now stop being suppressed and come forth once the Lord's autonomy has been subdued.

As to what these are, he says :

137. These are : affection *(vātsalya)*, **lordliness or ownership** *(svāmitva)*, **affability** *(sauśīlya)*, **accessibility** *(saulabhya)*, **knowledge** *(jñāna)*, **and power** *(śakti)*.

Affection *(vātsalya)* is the attitude of a cow towards her calf, where she accepts its defects with relish, gives it milk and nourishes it, and guards it from all who come near, with her horns and hooves. In the same way, the Lord also accepts [the soul's] sins with relish, nourishes him with his own qualities described as "virtues like milk,"[42] and watches out for both friends and enemies, as described [in the passages]. "[One who seeks refuge in me] will not be rejected for any reason"[43] and "[One who resorts to me even once and pleads "I am yours," to him I give] protection from all beings."[44]

Lordliness or ownership *(svāmitva)* refers to the close relationship [between the Lord and the soul] which is the reason why the Lord remains and does not leave [the soul], guarding his role [as owner and Lord] even if the cetana is averse to him. Because of this special relationship, the Lord brings about special qualities [in the soul] beginning with lack of aversion [to the Lord] *(adveṣa)* and culminating in service *(kaiṅkarya)* [to him].

Affability *(sauśīlya)* refers to how he eagerly swoops down to a level equal with everyone else and mingles with them flawlessly, thinking that it is for his own benefit, without expecting anything from them. This he does so that those who see the majesty of the Lord—the one of unconstrained power, owner of the dual realm[45] and consort of the Goddess—will not shrink back, thinking how puny they are [compared to him], saying [in Nammāḻvār's words], "Where does he stand ? And who am I ?"[46]

Accessibility *(saulabhya)* refers to how he not only makes himself visible, but accessible so that [cetanas] can take refuge in him if they see him.

Knowledge (*jñāna*) refers to his wisdom which is capable of penetrating simultaneously all things other than himself, which enables him to know in truth 1) what it is that the cetana doesn't want and needs to have taken away as well as 2) the thing he desires and needs to be given.

Power (*śakti*) refers to his capacity to do the impossible (*aghaṭitaghaṭanāsāmarthya*), which allows him to make those reprehensible [souls] who have been eternally bound in saṁsāra (*nityasaṁsāri*) attain the same rank as the most admirable angels (*nityasūri*).

Among these, the first four—affection, etc. [*vātsalya, svāmitva, sauśilya, saulabhya*]—make it easy to take refuge with him. The last two—knowledge, etc. [*jñāna, śakti*]—make it easy for him to act [to save] the one who has taken refuge in him. In the hymn beginning, "One of incomparable fame. . ."[47] the Āḻvār referred to these first four (affection, etc.) as facilitating taking refuge. Here, in this passage, when he refers to these latter two (knowledge and power), propriety or worthiness (*prāpti*) and perfection (*pūrti*) are implied, since these are also necessary for him to act [to save the soul].

He explains the function of each of these qualities in this context:

138. Affection *(vātsalya)* is for not being afraid upon seeing one's sins. Lordliness or ownership *(svāmitva)* is for being certain that the work will be done. Affability *(sauśilya)* is for not leaving upon seeing his lordliness. Knowledge and power *(jñāna, śakti)* are for removing obstacles and granting himself [as the final goal].

The Lord's affection (*vātsalya*), which [allows him] to accept [the soul's] sins with relish, is a way to keep the cetana who wants refuge from being afraid upon seeing his sins. Lordliness or ownership (*svāmitva*), which makes it such that all gain or loss belongs to him, allows [the cetana] to have faith that the work [of saving] him will be done, so he won't doubt whether he will or won't [be saved]. Affability (*sauśilya*), his ability to mingle with lowly creatures flawlessly, prevents [the cetana] from

retreating upon seeing that same lordliness (*svāmitva*) which proclaims [Viṣṇu's] supremacy as the owner and ruler of the dual realm. Accessibility (*saulabhya*), by which he makes himself visible, allows [the cetana] to see and resort to him, without any reluctance due to the Lord being beyond the senses. Knowledge and power (*jñāna, śakti*)—are necessary for removing the obstacles to attainment as stated in [the Caramaśloka] "I will release you from all sins,"[48] and offering himself as the goal. They also allow him to understand the previous condition of the one who is to be received [salvation], as well as his future course [in attaining the final goal], and then to bring about [the desired end] in accord with that understanding.

Since accessibility is the most important among these four qualities which make him easy [to seek refuge with] (*saukaryāpādakaguṇa)*, he reveals the culminating point of this accessibility :

139. The farthest extent of the accessibility referred to here is the *arcāvatāra*.

The culmination of [the Lord's] accesssibility—which in this word is said to facilitate taking refuge [with him]—is the *arcāvatāra*; here he takes as his holy form [an image] which those who depend on him find delightful and dwells in it continually, as it is said, "Whatever form our people desire, that you become."[49]

He explains this :

140. This, unlike his supreme (para) and evolutionary (*vyūha*) forms, or his incarnations (vibhava), is visible to the eye.

Unlike his supreme and evolutionary forms which cannot be seen because they are far away, and unlike his past incarnations which cannot be seen because they are remote in time, the *arcāvatāra* alone remains constantly visible to the eye because it is continually present.

Can all these qualities be seen in the *arcāvatāra* ? To this he says :

141. All these can be seen in Our Lord (*Namp̆erumāḷ*). [50]

All these qualities—those which make [being saved] easy (*saukaryapādaka*) and those which bring about that salvation (*kāryāpādaka*)—can be seen in Our Lord, for those who have a desire to see.

He states what aspects of [the image] of Our Lord illustrate each of these qualities, declaring that our refuge is the very posture in which he stands displaying these.

142. His very posture—the divine weapons clutched in his holy hands, his hand held in a gesture saying not to fear, his head crowned, his face, his smile, his holy feet pressed into the lotus seat—is our refuge.

[Our Lord] stands with his divine weapons, conch and discus, borne in his holy hands ; these show the knowledge and power (*jñāna, śakti*) that are used to accomplish [the soul's salvation]. His hand is held in a position which says "don't fear," thus showing his affection (*vātsalya*). His head is crowned to show his lordliness (*svāmitva*), his face and smile show his affability (*sauśilya*), and his holy feet are planted firmly in the lotus seat to show his accessibility (*saulabhya*), such that all may see and resort to him. This posture in which the Lord graciously stands is the savior (*rakṣaka*) for us who have no other recourse.

He states that the two characteristics required by those depending on him as means and end (*uyāya, upeya*) appear on the image which stands as described above :

143. His status as savior (*rakṣakatva*), and his delightfulness (*bhogyatva*) both shine forth in his holy figure.

His status as savior is shown by the divine weapons which assist salvation and the crown which symbolizes protection. These same things are objects of beauty, as stated [in the hymns] : "The conch and discus are your jewels," [51] and "Has the light of your face blossomed into the light of your crown ?" [52] Also, the hands held in benediction, the smiling face, and the feet planted on the

lotus seat are each paragons of great beauty. Therefore [the holy image] manifests delightfulness. Thus his status as a savior [or means, *upāya*] and his delightfulness [as a goal, *upeya*] both shine forth on his holy figure. Thus he has revealed the meaning of the word "nārāyaṇa."

After this he reveals the meaning of the word "caraṇau."

144. *"Caraṇau"* —**the holy feet.**

He gives the meaning of stating it in the dual form :

145. This states the beauty of [these two] together and the completeness (*pūrti*) of the means (*upāya*).

This word "caraṇau" means the two holy feet, described as "a pair of lotus feet."[53] It refers to the beauty of the two together, comparable to two lotus blossoms placed side by side. Since the dual form does not admit anything more than two, it also refers to the perfection or completeness of this upāya which does not tolerate any other aid.

After this he reveals the many qualities [of these feet] which are unique to their function as the upāya.

146. Even if the Goddess and he leave, the holy feet will not let go, but will remain "firm feet."[54]

Even if the Goddess (*pirātti*) herself, who is stated to be the mediator in the word "srimat," should say mean things [about the cetana]—and even if the one who possesses the superior qualities referred to in the word "nārāyaṇa," who [would normally] say "My devotees would never do that,"[55] should reject him—these holy feet will not let [the cetana] go. Rather, by ensnaring him with their indescribable perfection, these holy feet, described as "the illustrious Nārāyaṇa's firm feet,"[56] have the strength to keep those who have resorted to them from slipping away.

Using an illustration, he shows that the soul settles down at his holy feet not only out of attraction to their many qualities, but

also because to do so is in accord with the soul's true nature *śvarūpānuguṇa.*

147. The feet of the *śeṣī* is the place of refuge (*tuṟai*) where the *śeṣa* settles down, just as a child places his mouth on the breast

The holy feet are the place of refuge where the subservient creatures settle down and take refuge with their master (*śeṣī*) in accord with their true nature [as *śeṣas*]. This is just like when a nursing child, ignoring all other parts of his mother's body, puts his mouth on the breast which is designated just for him.

He says that this reference to the holy feet also implies the [Lord's] holy figure.

148. This word alludes to the Lord's holy figure (*tirumeṉi*) on which the Goddess resides and which manifests all [the divine] qualities, captivating and drawing toward it even *Śiśupāla.*

The word "caraṇau" refers to the holy feet which are a single part of his body ; this alludes to his divine auspicious body (*divyamaṅgalavigraha*). This holy figure is the residence of the Goddess, the intercessor referred to in the word "śrīmat", as stated [in the passage]. "The one with the chest on which Śrī resides."[57] This divine figure also displays the qualities referred to in the word "nārāyaṇa." It is of such a nature that it entranced even the despicable Śiśupāla, who had gone around making many abusive statements, as it is said, "Śiśupāla who had proclaimed many blasphemies."[58] By its beauty alone, it dispelled and transformed his hatred as it is said, "The one with the beauty to remove hatred" [59] and attracted him "to reach the presence of the holy feet." [60]

After this he gives the meaning of the word "śaraṇam".

149 "*Śaraṇam*"—the *upāya* which will not fail to grant what one desires and get rid of what is unwanted.

As it is said, "The word *śaraṇam* can mean upāya, house or protector, but this indicates appropriately only upāya."[61] Thus even though the word *ṣaraṇam* can signify protector, house or

upāya. in this context the reference is to the upāya alone. Furthermore, the action of the upāya is the reason for the attainment of one's desires and removal of what one doesn't want. Thus, for these reasons he revealed the meaning of this word as, "Śaraṇam"—the upāya which will not fail to grant what one desires and get rid of what is unwanted."

In his *Parantapati* [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] revealed in full what the desired and unwanted things are. Also in his *Śriyaḥpatippaṭi* he presented these concisely, saying :

> The things which are unwanted are ignorance, desires and aversions which result from ignorance, karma in the form of merits and sins, the four kinds of bodies (gods, etc.) and the succession of miseries (internal, etc.).[62] The things which are desired are to travel the path to the heavenly realm *(arccirādimārga)*, to reach the supreme abode *(paramapada)*, to see the Supreme Soul *(paramātman)*, and to serve the Lord, enjoying his qualities.[63]

Thus, these thoughts are worth contemplating here.

He reveals a hidden meaning in the statement that the aforementioned entity [the Lord] is the upāya:

150. This states that the goal *(prāpya)* himself is the means *(prāpaka)*.

This word, which indicates that the previously mentioned entity is the upāya, states that the one who is the goal is himself the means.

Has the goal been mentioned before ? To this he replies :

151. The three mentioned before are the goal.

The three [ideas] mentioned in the previous compound word [śrīman nārāyaṇa caraṇau"] are : 1) that he has the Goddess as an attribute, 2) that he has auspicious qualities, 3) that

he has a divine holy body. These very things are the goal. Indeed, these are referred to in the following passages as objects of [the saved soul's] enjoyment:

> In the highest world of Vaikuṇṭha, the Lord of the world, Viṣṇu, whose true self is incomprehensible, resides united with Śrī in the company of his loving devotees.[64]
>
> He who knows what is hidden in the secret place in the highest heaven, that wise one enjoys all pleasures, along with Brahmā.[65]
>
> The wise ones *(sūri)* always see the highest abode of Viṣṇu.[66]

If so, then what makes [the Lord] become the upāya? To this he replies:

152. Just by ceasing his own actions, this one [the cetana] makes that one [the Lord] into the *upāya*.

The soul who is helpless and without any other recourse *(akiñcana, ananyagati)*, just by ceasing his own activity,[67] causes the very one who is the goal to become the means, in the same way that one would make milk which is a pleasurable [end in itself] into a medicine [which is a means to cure a disease].[68]

He states that this phrase declares a superior characteristic of this upāya.

153 The phrase "*caraṇau śaraṇam*" declares this *upāya* to be different from any other *upāya*.

Since the phrase "caraṇau śaraṇam" declares that same entity which is the goal to be the means, it shows that this upāya is different from other upāyas where the object to be attained is one thing and the means of attaining it is another.

Next, he reveals the meaning of the verb, "prapadye."

154. "Prapadye"—I resort to.

Since this word is derived from the verbal root *pad—*, meaning to go, and since it is in the first person, he gives the meaning as "I resort to."

Since this could mean any or all of the three methods of acting—verbal, mental, or physical—by which of these agents does it say this resorting is to come about ? To this he says :

155 Even if one resorts [to him] verbally and physically, there is no loss of the final attainment. But since *mokṣa* is from knowledge, *(jñānāt mokṣa)* it should be mental.

One may resort to him with a single utterance requesting protection, such as "Be my refuge." [69] Or, one may resort to him in a single act of approaching the savior, as did the hunter [70] and the crow, with hands folded in an *añjali,* [a gesture] which provokes the Lord's grace. Indeed, it is said, "An *añjali* is the best *mudrā,* which quickly pacifies the Lord."[71] Even so, the attainment of the result will not fail. However, since it is declared that "Mokṣa comes from knowledge,"[72] resorting should come about mentally. This [resorting to the Lord] is a special form of understanding (*buddhiviśesa*) which [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has described elaborately in his *Parantapaṭi.* In his *Śriyaḥpatippati* he said :

> This special form of understanding *(buddhiviśeṣa)* is a particular way of thinking which : 1) results from recognizing that one is a *śeṣa* of no one else [but the Lord], 2) is distinct from other upāyas, 3) consists of accepting the Lord as a protector, 4) is to be done once and for all, 5) has neither vacillation nor delay, 6) everyone is qualified for, 7) has no rigid rules [regarding performance], 8) does not require that one's last thoughts [at the moment of death be on the Lord],[73] 9) is very easy to do, 10) contains a request, 11) consists of firm faith. [74]

Thus the ideas he revealed there should be contemplated in this context, too.

Does thought alone suffice ? Or is it necessary to accept [the Lord] by all three agents, as in such statements as "by mind and body and speech"? [75] To this he replies :

156 Since he is the *upāya* and these are not the direct *upāya*, there is no restriction saying that al. three are required.

The upāya for accomplishing the result is the Lord to whom one resorts. The resorting which takes place by the three agents is not the direct upāya (*sākṣāt upāya*)—at the outset it may appear to be the upāya, but then [that notion] disappears. Therefore only one acceptance, consisting of faith that the result will be accomplished, is sufficient. There is no restriction that all three are needed.

There is an alternative interpretation : Why is it that he states it in this way, restricting it to only one [of the three agents]? Isn't it possible that resorting by all three agents is prescribed ? In reply, this states that one alone is sufficient ; there is no rule stating that all three are needed. Since there is no restriction, it is obvious that there is no fault if acceptance comes about by all three agents. In his *Parantapati* he has revealed :

> Whether seeking refuge takes place by three agents or one, there is no lack of attainment of the result. The three agents are needed to fulfil [the cetana's] own qualification [for taking refuge] (*adhikāripūrti*).[76] But for attainment of the result, one agent alone is sufficient. In the same way, for the fulfilment of the upaya, the Lord's status as the husband of Śrī, his attributes of affection, etc., and his possession of a divine, holy body are expected. Similarly, for the fulfilment of the [cetana's] qualification, the three agents are necessary.[77]

Such statements as the following proclaim that prapatti is to be done once and for all :

> This [prapatti], the essence of the śāstras, done once and for all, transports one [across the sea of saṁsāra].[78]

> To one who has done prapatti once and for all, and who pleads "I am yours," to him I give protection from all creatures; this is my vow.[79]

So why is it stated in the present tense ? To this he reveals :

157. The present tense is for the purpose of meditation, when ***sattva*** **arises and [the cetana] then becomes afraid.**

I have taken refuge with your feet that encompassed the world, O Lord.[80]

I have attained union with your feet.[81]

I came and sank beneath your feet.[82]

Unlike the above passages, this "prapadye—I resort to" is stated in the present tense. The reason is that one who is still attached to the material world, when disturbed by the *guṇas* of *rajas* and *tamas*, may happen to do some upāya or some misdeed. Afterwards, when *sattva* comes to the fore, he will repent and become afraid. There is no atonement for this except prapatti, as it is said, "The atonement *(prāyaścitta)* is to take refuge again, then and there." [83] But after [prapatti] is done once and for all, doing it again is not proper. Therefore, stating it in the present tense allows one to think about one's previous performance [of prapatti] and be relieved.

He reveals that there are several other uses for this present tense :

158. This [reflecting] is done so that the mind will not follow after other ***upāyas*****, to occupy one's time, and because it is impossible to give up due to its sweetness.**

It is appropriate to go on thinking of [one's earlier prapatti] incessantly [for the following reasons :] 1) so that the mind will not involve itself with other upāyas as a result of previous tendencies, 2) in order to occupy one's time, and 3) because it is so irresistably delightful.

On the other hand, if one asks whether it is necessary to meditate on this many times to attain the result, he replies :

159. If one thinks that many repetitions are necessary for attainment, this *upāya* slips away.

If one concludes that it is necessary to meditate on this many times in order to attain the result, rather than for the previously mentioned purposes, the *siddhopāya* who does not tolerate association with other aids will slip away automatically, like the Brahmāstra in conjunction with a jute cord.[84]

Thus he has stated the meaning of the first sentence. After this, he begins to present the meaning of the last sentence [of the Dvayam].

160. The last sentence states the goal (*prāpya*).

The goal is to serve at the feet of the Lord of all, the owner of all and the husband of Śrī.

He reveals the purpose of stating the goal (*prāpya*) after the choosing of the means (*prāpakavaraṇa*).

161. This says [it is] not for any other goal.

Since the sādhana explained in the foregoing sentence is common to any of the four goals, this states that the choosing of the means done previously is not for any other aim. That is the purpose of stating the goal here.

Why is it necessary to relinquish other goals and aim for this one only? To this he replies :

162. One relinquishes other *upāyas* and resorts only to the final *upāya* (*caramopāya*),[85] in the same way, one relinquishes *kaivalya* and wealth (*aiśvarya*)—the other *upeyas*—and requests the ultimate goal.

When one chooses the upāya, in accord with his true nature *(svarūpa)* of having no other refuge [but the Lord] *(ananya-śaraṇatva)*, he relinquishes the other upāyas—*karma, jñāna,* and

bhakti—and resorts to the ultimate *siddhopāya* [the Lord]. In the same way, when one requests the *upeya* or goal, in accord with his true nature of having no other delight [than the Lord] *(ananya-bhogatva)*, he relinquishes wealth *(aiśvarya)* and solitary enjoyment of the ātman *(kaivalya)*—the other aims—and requests the ultimate goal.

He brings up the question raised by those who think that it is superfluous to make a request to the Lord who knows one's thoughts :

163 Does he have to request this of the Lord? Doesn't the omniscient one know his thoughts ?

He replies :

164. When he hears [the cetana's] prayer, [the Lord's] heart rejoices.

When a child who has not wanted to eat due to illness recovers from his disease, his mother is delighted when she hears his request for food. It is the same for one who has had the disease of desiring other aims—without any desire for this one—since time immemorial. If the desire for this goal arises in him and he approaches the Lord, the *śeṣī*'s heart rejoices when he hears [the cetana's] prayer requesting this goal. That's the only reason for requesting it.

After this, with the intention of giving the word-by-word meaning of this sentence, he takes up its first word, "śrīmate."

165. "*Śrīmate*"—To the one who is united with the Goddess *(pĕriyapirāṭṭiyar)*.

Thus he gives its meaning as "to the one who is united with the Goddess." Here, too, as stated in the first sentence, the two ways of conjugating the verb *śrī* and their respective meanings, along with the eternal union [of the Lord and Śrī] indicated by the suffix *mat*, are all to be considered [here].

Even though their eternal union applies in both cases, he reveals her particular state in each situation :

166. When he is the means *(upāya)*, **she is the mediator** *(puruṣakāra)*; **When he is the goal** *(prāpya)* **she is the one who promotes service** *(kaiṅkarya)*.

When the Lord becomes the means for destroying that which is unwanted by the cetanas and granting what they desire, he cannot tolerate association with any other [upāya] as an aid (*sahāyantarasaṁsargattai sahiyāmai*). So she, without participating in the upāya, becomes the mediator, making it so that when the Lord is angered upon seeing the offenses of the sinful cetanas, he will forgive their sins and accept them. When the Lord becomes the goal by receiving the cetanas' service, she also becomes the goal as a recipient of service like the Lord. She increases the Lord's delight by multiplying ten-fold in his mind the service they do. In this way she is the one who promotes their service.

[Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has revealed the same thing more elaborately in his *Parantapati* :

> The word "śrīmat" in the first sentence states how, when she sees the offenses of the cetanas and the autonomy of the Lord, she says, "I must approach him and make him save them, so they won't be destroyed as targets of his anger." Thus in order to join the sinful cetanas with the Lord, she stays forever united with him and never leaves. Here [in the second sentence] the word "śrīmat" refers to her state as a recipient. It shows how she remains forever united with him, not leaving even for an instant, [for two reasons :] 1) in order to magnify ten-fold in the Lord's mind the service that the cetanas do, and 2) because of her unbroken attachment [to the Lord] (*nirantarasaṁśleṣa*), for she would cease to exist if there was any interruption in her experience of the Lord.[86]

He reveals that this second sentence [in the Dvayam] is an explanation of the last word in the Tirumantra :

167. Here the goal stated in the Tirumantra is recalled in detail.

This sentence states literally that the recipient of service is [the divine] couple ; this refers clearly to the goal which was suggested in the word "nārāyaṇāya" of the Tirumantra, since it is only implied there that the recipient of service is [the divine] couple. There it did not [explicitly] state that the one who accepts service needs to be united with Śrī or that the one who does service needs to be selfless (*nirmama*) ; it only went so far as to say, "I want to be one who has attained [the goal of] doing service to Nārāyaṇa alone." Therefore, since both of these meanings are stated here, this sentence is an explanation of that word [Nārāyaṇa].

What is the necessity of saying that one needs to do service to the couple ? To this he replies :

168. Like *Lakṣmaṇa* (*iḷaiyapĕrumāḷ*), it is proper to do service to the two united as a couple

Lakṣmaṇa performed service to the Lord and the Goddess united, saying "O Lord, as you roam over mountains and valleys with Vaidehī [Sītā], I will do all [kinds of service] for you, whether you are awake or asleep."[87] In the same way, doing service to the couple united is appropriate to the soul's true nature. Since [the soul's] essential nature (*svarūpa*) is subservience to both of them, service to the couple is inherently proper (*svarūpaprāpta*).

He furthermore reveals the distinctive quality (*vāci*) which is present when service is done to the two together :

169. Only in their union will service be obtained and bring joy.

She is the one who causes the autonomous Lord graciously to accept the [cetana's] service rather than ignore it. For this reason, it was when she was present that Lakṣmaṇa requested and attained service in accord with his true nature, in the passages : "He said to Sītā [and Rāma]," and "Facing Sītā, he addressed this to Rāma."[88] In the same way, it is only when the Lord and Śrī are united that the service the cetana requests will be

realized. Furthermore, just as a son will enjoy attending his parents only when both mother and father are together, it is only when the Lord and Śrī are united that service will be pleasurable.

After this, he explains the second word, "nārāyaṇa."

170. *"Nārāyaṇāya"*—**to the one who is the** ***śeṣī*** **of all.**

Since Nārāyaṇa is the Lord of the dual realm [earthly and heavenly] [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says "to the one who is the *śeṣī* of all." The one who is the recipient *(pratisambandhi)* of service is the *śeṣī*.

Service (*kaiṅkarya*) consists of acts of love springing from experience [of the Lord]. This love is dependent on the object to be experienced. Therefore, it is necessary to articulate that object to be experienced. Thus he says :

171. This word denotes his holy figure ***(tirumeṇi)*** **and his qualities.**

This word indicating the recipient of service refers to the divine form and qualities which are the object of the experienee that precedes service. As indicated [in the passages], "The wise ones *(sūri)* always see the highest abode of Viṣṇu,"[89] and "That [wise one] enjoys all pleasures,"[90] [the Lord's] divine, holy form and auspicious qualities are enjoyable and inspire service just like his essential nature, as described [in the Upaniṣad] "Attaining that delight [Brahman], he becomes blissful."[91] Since he says "qualities *(guṇaṅkal)*" in general, all his attributes—without distinction between his qualities of knowledge and power, etc., his qualities of affection, etc., and his qualities of valor *(śaurya)*, etc,—are to be experienced. The particular qualities which are contemplated in the word "nārāyaṇa" of the previous sentence are appropriate to choosing the upāya; these same qualities are also to be thought of in this word as the goal. Just as there are two forms *[upāya* and *upeya]* of the [Lord's] essential nature which is the locus *(āśraya)* [of these qualities] there are two forms of his special qualities which have [the Lord's *svarūpa*] as their locus *(āśrayi)*. All this [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has revealed in the *Parantapaṭi*.

After this he states the main intention of this word here :

172. This points to [the Lord's] *śeṣitva.*

Since the object of experience is unspecified, it has been explained that this refers to all [the Lord's] qualities. However, since the Lord's aspect as the *śeṣī* is especially appropriate to the specific meaning given in the dative case ending, this word refers particularly to his *śeṣitva.*

He reveals the purpose of referring to his *śesitva.*

173. Service to a proper object *(prāptaviṣaya)* **is indeed delightful.**

It is stated [in scripture] that "All dependence on others *(paravaśa)* is painful," and "Service is a dog's job."[92] But unlike service done for an unworthy object which is objectionable, service done to a worthy object is acceptable and indeed delightful, as stated in the passages, "[Whichever way the creator and ordainer goes, that way one should go along. . .] as a shadow follows a creature,"[93] and "Why shouldn't it be served, [that shade of the tree which is Vāsudeva; it is neither too cold nor too hot, and it extinguishes the coals of hell]."[94]

After this he reveals the meaning of the suffix on this word ["nārāyaṇāya"].

174. This fourth case [dative] ending proclaims service *(kaiṅkarya).*

Since it occurs immediately after the acceptance of the upāya, which results from recognizing one's status as a *śeṣa*, this fourth case [dative] ending not only means "for his sake" *(tādarthya),* but it also proclaims the service which results from the upāya which has been accepted. "Proclaims service" means it explains the request for service. "Service" means special activities which cause the Lord's joy As the following passages indicate, this service is both verbal and physical :

He sits singing the *sāman.*[95]

Those who pay homage.[96]

Whichever way the creator and ordainer goes, that way one should go along.[97]

If this service is to be requested, does that mean [one is to serve] only on occasion ? To this he replies :

175. Service indeed is eternal.

Subservience (*śesatva*) is the soul's essential nature, and in the absence of doing something (*akiñcitkara*) that subservience is not established, as it is said: "One who doesn't do anything does not fulfill his subservience (*śeṣatva*)."[98] Therefore service is eternal for the soul. Thus the ācāryas have declared, "[When] will I delight you doing service [devotedly, with you as the Lord of my life][99] and "I will serve you eternally."[100]

If service is eternal, is it necessary to request it ? To this he says :

176. It must be attained by constantly requesting it.

Since the object [of service, the Lord] is extremely lofty, and since the one who does the service is extremely dependent, and since without the request service will not be accomplished, it must be attained through constant prayer.

He gives the reason for constantly requesting it :

177. Promoting the glory of the *śeṣī* is the *śesa*'s true self-realization *(svarūpalābha)* and goal *(prāpya)*.

One who does not glorify the *śeṣī* lacks subservience (*śeṣatva*), as it is said, "There is no subservience (*śeṣatva*) for one who does not do anything."[101] Therefore promoting the glory—the pleasure—of the Lord and *śesī* is [the cetana's] special occupation; it allows him to realize his essential nature. Since [serving and glorifying the Lord] is a way to give joy to the Lord, that is the goal. Thus it is to be requested constantly.

After this he explains the last word, "namaḥ."

178. ***"Namaḥ"*—that which removes all defects in service.**

The general import of the word *namas* destroys egoism (*ahaṅkāra*) and possessiveness *(mamakāra)*. Though it is capable of destroying the obstacles to one's true nature, the means, and the ultimate aim *(svarūpa, upāya, puruṣārtha)* as in the *namas* which is the middle word of the Tirumantra, here it is not the same. Since it is stated here after the prayer for service, [in this context] it destroys the obstacles to service.

He reveals what the defect of service is :

179. The defect is doing it for oneself.

"Doing it for oneself" means thinking it to be a means to one's own pleasure—that is, thinking "I am the enjoyer and mine is the enjoyment."[102] [We ought to do it] with the idea that it is acceptable for us only because it pleases the Lord. But if, instead, we do it while affirming ourselves to be the enjoyers and owners (*bhoktṛtva, madīyatva*) then this is contrary to our ultimate aim *(puruṣārtha)*.

Furthermore, in this [word "namaḥ"] the obstacles to the attainment of this service are destroyed.

180 In this [word "namah"], ignorance, etc. are also destroyed.

In this word "namah" which prays for the destruction of egoism (*ahaṅkāra*) and possessiveness *(mamakāra)* there is also the destruction of [the following] :

1) the ignorance of considering that which is not the soul to be the soul, which makes one engage in action (*karma*), as stated [in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*] :

> The thought that what is not the soul is the soul, and the thought of ownership in what one does not own— this is the two-fold seed which gives rise to the tree of ignorance.[103]

2) the *karma* which results from such action, and

3) the bondage to the material realm which results from that *karma*.

For this reason, in contemplating the word *namas* in the [*Śaraṇāgati*] *Gadya,* which elaborates the Dvayam, Rāmānuja prayed for 1) the destruction of all karmas (of omission, commission, etc.) by the phrase beginning "manovākkāyaiḥ . . . ,[104] 2) the destruction of ignorance by the phrase beginning "anādikālapravṛtta . . . ,[105] and 3) the destruction of bondage to the material realm by the phrase beginning, "madīyānādi . . .[106]

Since the relinquishing of self–purposedness (*svaprayojana*) in service is the chief meaning, he explains this further. First, he answers the question of how one ought to be while doing service :

181. One should be as in the [passage], "To you alone we do service," [107]

When service is done [we should be thinking], as [Āṇṭāḷ] said, "To you alone we do service." That is, we need to do service for your enjoyment alone, not yours and ours. According to this, we need to do it for the joy of the *śeṣi* alone. The Āḻvār also revealed this, saying "Take me for your sake."[108]

With the following two sentences he states the obstacles to this service :

182. Beauty is an obstacle. So is the service mentioned before.

His physical beauty is so beguiling it can cause one to falter. Therefore it is an obstacle to service. The service referred to by the fourth case–ending prior to this *namas,* like the attendance given to one's beloved, is a way to gain pleasure for oneself. Therefore even it is an obstacle to this service whose purpose is to be the Lord's enjoyment.

Such being the case, he reveals that the request for destruction of these obstacles must be made continually :

183. Like the prayer for service, the prayer in this word is also continual.

The prayer for service stated in the fourth case-ending has been declared to be continual, not just occasional. Similarly, the prayer for the destruction of obstacles to service stated in this word should be made at all times, no matter whether we are here [on earth] or have reached the heavenly realm *(prāpyabhūmi.)*

Does [the obstacle] of self-enjoyment arise even in the land which is free from all evil ? To this he replies :

184. Is it not said, "The remedy for uprooting our enjoyment."[109]

"Oh you who are the remedy which cuts off the thoughts of our own enjoyment of the bliss which comes from experiencing you, [the remedy] which heals us so that our essential nature won't be destroyed." This, in the form of a prayer, is what the eternally free souls (*nityasūrikaḷ*) utter. Thus even there the thought of one's own enjoyment can arise due to the [Lord's] magnificence. So it is appropriate to state in this word that the prayer is eternal. For this reason the freed souls (*muktar*) are described as "those who say 'namas' indeed !"[110]

Thus [in summary] the following have been explained :

1) [the Goddess'] mediation,

2) her eternal union [with the Lord],

3) his qualities of affection, etc., which arise from this [mediation],

4) his divine, auspicious form *(divyamaṅgalavigraha)* which displays those qualities,

5) that the property of being the upāya belongs to the one so endowed with these qualities and with this divine form,

6) the acceptance of that upāya,

7) that the recipient of the service which is the aim of [the upāya] is a couple [the Lord and the Goddess],

8) that the entity [qualified by these attributes] is the *śeṣi* of all,

9) the service given to him,

10) the destruction of obstacles to that service.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Pěriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai in his *Parantarahasya*, and Vādikeśari Jīyar in his *Vādikeśari Kārikā*.
2. "Having completely relinquished father, mother, wives, sons, kinsman, friends, gurus, jewels, money, food, fields, and possessions, all dharmas, all desires, along with the imperishable *(akṣara)*, I have taken refuge with your feet that encompassed the world." Attributed to *Vihaghendra Saṁhitā*, Paṭalam 22. Also quoted by Rāmānuja in his *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, *SM* p. 10.
3. *TVM* 9.3.7.
4. *TVM* 6.9.9.
5. *Tirunetuntāṇṭakam* 6, *NDP*.
6. *Tirukkuṟuntāṇṭakam* 19, *NDP*.
7. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.23, *US*.
8. *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā*, 37.30–31.
9. Yāmuna's *Stotraratna* 22, *SM*.

10. *TVM* 6.10.10.

11. Piḷḷai Lokācārya's brief work, the *Prapanna Paritrāṇa*, is an exegesis of these two concepts (*ADR* pp. 70–71).

12. *Amarakośa* 1.1.28b.

13. Reference unknown.

14. Variously attributed to Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣyam* and *Harigrantha*.

15. This is a direct attack on the understanding of Śrī held by Vedānta Deśika and the Vaṭakalai school. Deśika makes this same argument, that since Śrī is an inseparable attribute or quality of the Lord, according to the *apṛthaksiddhibhāva* of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, she cannot be excluded from either the upāya or upeya (*RTS* ch. 23 : pp. 567–8). He argues that it is unwarranted to interpret the "śrīman" differently in the first and second sentences of the Dvayam (*RTS* ch. 23 : p. 652.).

16. *BhG* 5.29.

17. *BhG* 9.29.

18. Parāśara Bhaṭṭar's *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* 52, *SM*.

19. *BhG* 16.19.

20. Attributed to *Varāha Purāṇa*.

21. *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* 52, *SM*.

22. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, 1.9.1.

23. Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, *SM*.

24. *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 2.2.3 *NDP*.

25. "Viṣṇupatnī." *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, ed. Satvalekar (Aundh, Maharashtra : Bharata Press, 1945) 4.4.12.13.

26. *Tirunetuntāṇtakam* 18, *NDP.*

27. *Rā* 6.116.39.

28. *Rā* 6.116.45.

29. *Mūṉṟām Tiruvantāti* 3, *NDP.*

30. *Përiya Tirumōḻi* 8.10.1, *NDP.*

31. *TVM* 3.10.8.

32. *Përiyāḻvār Tirumōḻi* 3.10.7, *NDP.*

33. *Përiya Tirumōḻi* 5.8.2, *NDP.*

34. *Mūṉṟām Tiruvantāti* 100, *NDP.*

35. *Përiyāḻvār Tirumōḻi* 3.10.7, *NDP.*

36. *Përiya Tirumōḻi* 2.5.6, *NDP.*

37. Aḻakiyamaṇavāḷa Përumāḷ Nāyaṉār, *Aruḷiccëyal Rahasya*, ed. Velukkuti Varadacharya Swami (Trichy : S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, 1972) p. 131.

38. *BhG*, Rāmānuja's introduction to the *Gītābhāṣya*.

39. Kūreśa's *Śrīvaikuṇṭhastava* 61, *SM*.

40. *Lakṣmī Tantra* 28.14.

41. *Rā* 5.36.29. By expressing pity for the crow, Kākāsura, who had attacked her breast, Sītā prevented it from being killed by Rāma.

42. *Përiya Tiruvantāti* 58, *NDP*,

43. *Rā* 6.12.3.

44. *Rā* 6.12.20, later known as the Rāmāyaṇa Caramaśloka. (See Introduction.)

45. "Ubhayavibhūti" or dual realm refers to the heavenly, eternal realm of Vaikuṇṭha (*nityavibhūti*), and saṁsāra which is the realm of the Lord's sport (*līlāvibhūti*)

46. *TVM* 5.1.7.

47. *TVM* 6.10.10 : "O one on whose chest dwells the lady of the lotus, refusing to leave even for a moment ! O one of incomparable fame ! O one who possesses the three worlds ! O one who rules me ! O one who dwells in Tiruveṅkaṭam where sublime deities and sages like to come ! I have approached your feet humbly, with no other refuge."

48. *BhG* 18.66.

49. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* 44, *NDP.*

50. In the Srirangam temple, the proceesional image of Viṣṇu here described is affectionately called "Nampĕrumāḷ—Our Lord."

51. *TVM* 8.3.6.

52. *TVM* 3.1.1.

53. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 1.8.3, *NDP.*

54. *TVM* 1.2.10.

55. *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 4.9.2. (See *cūrṇā* 262 for full translation.)

56. *TVM* 1.2.10.

57. *Mūṉṟām Tiruvantāti* 57, *NDP.*

58. *Përiyālvār Tirumōḻi* 4.3.5, *NDP.*

59. *Ibid.*

60. *TVM* 7.5.3.

61. *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā* 37.29.

62. The four kinds of bodies : gods, men, animals, and plants. The three kinds of miseries : internal in origin (*ādhyātmika*), caused by deities (*ādhidaivika*), caused by animate beings (*ādhibautika*).

63. *Śriyaḥpatippati*, *ADR* p. 193.

64. Attributed to *Śaivapurāṇa.*

65. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.1, *US.*

66. *Ṛg Veda* 1.22.20.

67. Maṇavāḷamāmuni's phrase, "cëyal māṭciyāle," is ambiguous and could be taken to mean "by the greatness of his action" as well as "by ceasing his action." The former, however, would be antithetical to Maṇavāḷamāmuni's views expressed elsewhere. Or, some think "by the greatness of his action" could be meant sarcastically.

68. See *cūrṇā* 189 for a fuller explanation of the milk and medicine analogy.

69. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 3.7.33.

70. "Niṣāda" can mean hunter or possibly demon. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the hunter Guha did not actively approach the Lord seeking refuge, but the Rākṣasa Vibhīṣaṇa and the crow Kākāsura did. It is not clear who is being referred to here.

71. Attributed to *Garuḍa Purāṇa.*

72. "Jñānāt mokṣa," *Mbh* 12.306.84 : "For men moksa comes from knowledge, O King ; this is not said merely out of ignorance. So knowledge must be investigated rigorously, and thereby one can gain release from birth and death."

73. Bhaktiyoga is understood in Śrīvaiṣṇavism to demand as its final step the *antimasmṛti* or remembrance of God at the time of death, as described in *BhG* 8.9–10. This makes for uncertainty for the *bhaktiyogin*, since omission of it can mean that one must take birth in another body to complete *bhaktiyoga.* Prapatti is considered safer and therefore superior because it is a one-time event and does not demand any particular meditation at the time of death.

74. *Śriyaḥpatippaṭi, ADR* p. 193.

75. *TVM* 6.5.11.

76. The Tĕṉkalai ācāryas dispute the Vaṭakalai position that prapatti is a *sādhana* for which specific *aṅgas* or accessories are stipulated (*ānukūlyasaṅkalpa, prātikūlyavarjana, kārpaṇya, mahāviśvāsa, goptṛtvavaraṇa*, along with *bharanyāsa*, prapatti itself). The Tĕṉkalai assert that prapatti itself is a simple, easy, one-time mental affirmation. This claim, however, is balanced by a tendency to emphasize the difficulty in qualifying for prapatti—becoming an *adhikāri.*

77. *Parantapaṭi, ADR* p. 166.

78. *Lakṣmī Tantra* 17.92.

79. *Rā* 6.12.20.

80. Attributed to *Vihaghendra Saṁhitā*, Paṭalam 22.

81. *Pĕriya Tirumŏḻi* 5.8.1, *NDP.*

82. *TVM* 6.10.10.

83. *Lakṣmī Tantra* 17.93. Vedānta Deśika and the Vaṭakalai school depend much more heavily on this verse than on the one immediately preceding, which claims that prapatti is done once and for all. Thus they affirm that prapatti has to be repeated whenever the prapanna happens to commit any future deliberate sin. Though prapatti need be done only once to assure mokṣa, Deśika says that unless one atones for subsequent sin with another prapatti as a *prāyaś-citta*, one's final attainment could be delayed in order to experience the punishment for that sin (*RTS* ch. 18: pp. 518 ff. ch. 25 : pp. 782–3).

84. Śrīvaiṣṇava theologians often use the Brahmāstra analogy, from an incident attributed to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, to show how prapatti cannot tolerate association with other upāyas. The powerful Brahmāstra weapon demanded that one have faith in its efficacy. At one point the Rākṣasas had Hanumān helplessly bound with the Brahmāstra. But, doubting its efficacy, they attempted to further secure him with a jute cord. At that point the Brahmāstra slipped off and Hanumān escaped. The incident is not found in this form in any current recension of the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa*. For a more elaborate discussion, see *Jñānasāra* 28 in *Jñānasāra Prameya-sāra* of Aruḷāḷa Pĕrumāḷ. Empĕrumāṉār with Maṇavāḷa-māmuni's commentary, ed. Vidvān Veṅkatācharya and Tiruveṅkaṭacharya (Kanchi ; Śrīvaiṣṇava Mudrāpaka Sabhā, 1916).

85. In Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Śrīvacana Bhūṣaṇa* (and in most later Tĕṉkalai texts) the term *caramopāya* is used to mean *ācāryābhimāna*, the love of the ācarya for his disciple, a means (upāya) to the ultimate attainment which is distinct from prapatti. Here, the context indicates *caramopāya* means prapatti.

86. *Parantapati*, *ADR* pp. 168–9.

87. *Rā* 2.28.10.

88. "Lakṣmaṇa clasped his brother's feet firmly and said to Sītā and to the great-vowed Rāma" (variant reading of *Rā* 2.28.1). "Thus instructed by Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa folded his hands and, facing Sītā, he addressed this to Rāma" (*Rā* 3.14.6–7). These passages are cited to show that Lakṣmaṇa made his successful requests for service only in the presence of Sītā.

89. *Ṛg Veda* 1.22.20.

90. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.1, *US*.

91. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7, *US*.

92. *Manusmṛti* 4.160 and 4.6. See *cūrṇa* 51 and note.

93. Attributed to *Paramasaṁhitā*.

94. *Garuḍa Purāṇa* 1.230.31.

95. *Tattirīya Upaniṣad* 3.10, *US*.

96. *Mbh* 12.323.36.

97. Attributed to *Paramasaṁhitā*.

98. "Akiñcitkarasya śeṣatvānupapattiḥ." Attributed to Mīmāṁsā.

99. Yāmuna's *Stotraratna* 46, *SM*.

100. Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, closing lines, *SM* p. 12.

101. "Nākiñcitkurvataḥ śeṣatvam." Attributed to Mīmāṁsā.

102. A Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

103. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 6.7.11, but in P. B. Annangaracharya's edition, the word *saṁsāra* appears instead of *avidyā* (ignorance).

104. "Please forgive completely all the beginningless and endless sins of omission or commission I have done by word, mind or deed against you or your devotees—offenses which are endless, of many kinds, and unforgiveable, which I have or have not begun to commit, which I have done, am doing, or will do." Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, *SM* p. 10.

105. "Please forgive all the wrong ideas I have indulged in since beginningless time, and all the wrong actions that I am doing, will do, or have done, toward myself, toward the entire world and toward anything at all." Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya* (immediately following previous passage), *SM* p. 11.

106. "Please rescue me from my *māyā* which is like a flowing current of beginningless and endless karma, obscuring your essential nature ; that fatal *māyā* born of perverse knowledge and from the idea that I am the enjoyer ; that *māyā* consisting of the three *guṇa*s which comes with having a body and senses, the capacity to enjoy, and a subtle form. I am your servant, having proclaimed myself to be one who has surrendered to you (*śaraṇāgata*), and is now your slave." Rāmānuja's *Śaraṇāgatigadya* (immediately following previous passage), *SM* p. 11.

107. "To you alone we do service, desiring nothing more." Āṇṭāḷ's *Tiruppāvai* 29, *NDP*.

108. *TVM* 2.9.4.

109. *TVM* 9.3.4.

110. *Mbh* 12.323.36.

THE CARAMASLOKA

After giving the meaning of the Dvayam, the middle rahasya, he reveals the meaning of the Caramaśloka, the last rahasya. This mantra is the essence of the *Gitopaniṣad* which is the essence of the fifth Veda [the *Mahābhārata*]. It can be seen that the Caramaśloka is a further explanation of the Dvayam. In its first line the Lord himself enjoins the choosing of the upāya which is stated in the first phrase of the Dvayam ; this [first line of the Caramaśloka] literally explains 1) what the choosing of the upāya is aimed at, 2) that relinquishing other sādhanas is the ancillary (aṅga) of such choosing, and 3) that this choosing is devoid of any thought that it is a sādhana. Furthermore, the Caramaśloka's second line literally explains the deliverance from all sins which obstruct [the final] attainment; this deliverance is what precedes the service *(kaiṅkarya)* referred to in the last sentence of the Dvayam.

Indeed, it was in order to hear the meaning of this mantra that Rāmānuja approached Tirukkoṭṭiyūr Nampi eighteen times. Nampi, recognizing the difficulty of its meaning and the lack of people who were qualified for it, exhausted Rāmānuja by making him come back many times, take vows, fast for a month—all in order to test his faith and zeal. Only after thus impressing on him its rare value, did Nampi finally reveal it to him.

One must: 1) be firmly established in the purest piety (*niṣkṛṣṭa–satvanisṭha*), 2) delight only in the Paramātman, 3) have aversion to all other than him, 4) be an obedient follower of the

scriptures, 5) upon hearing of the Lord's greatness, have abundant faith that it is true, 6) be a foremost believer. Only a person like this is qualified to hear the meaning of this śloka and practice it. Thus it is very hard to find those who are qualified for it For this reason, and because of the venerable importance (*gaurava*) of its meaning, Rāmānuja's predecessors had kept it a secret, without making it public.

But Rāmānuja's overwhelming compassion made him unable to bear seeing the distress of those in saṁsāra. Thus, regardless of the preciousness of the Caramaśloka's meaning, when he saw their suffering, he publicized it.[1]

Not only did [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] teach it [orally] in the way [Rāmānuja did], but out of his supreme compassion, he wanted everyone to know the meaning [of the Caramaśloka] and be saved. Therefore he revealed this same meaning both concisely and elaborately in many books. But unlike all his other works, in this book it is clearly presented such that even women and children can study it.

In the beginning, to impress on everyone's heart the importance of the Caramaśloka's meaning, he presents the reasons why it bears the holy name of "Caramaśloka."

185. Previously several *upāyas* had been taught. Considering how they were difficult and opposed to the soul's essential nature (*svarūpa*), Arjuna was stricken with grief. To remove his grief, *Kṛṣṇa* revealed to him this last (*carama*) *upāya*, which is such that "There is nothing beyond this." Therefore it bears the name "*Caramaślokā*."

In the many chapters [of the *Bhagavad Gītā*] prior to this śloka, Kṛṣṇa had elaborately revealed several different upāyas—karmayoga, jñānayoga, etc.—as sādhanas to mokṣa and attainment of Himself. Arjuna realized that they were impossible to perform because of the physical exertion they demanded, the difficulty of controlling the senses, and the necessity of performing these upāyas assiduously for a long time. He also realized that since they involved self-efforts, they were obstacles to the dependent

nature [of the soul], declared to be the Lord's own body. So Arjuna was pierced with grief, thinking "It can't be that one can attain Our Lord with these. Alas, I have lost him forever!" In order to remove his grief, [Lord Kṛṣṇa] revealed the final upāya, which is very easy to do, in accord with the soul's essential nature, and unsurpassed. Hence it has received the holy name of "Caramaśloka.

Hereafter, he presents the meaning of this śloka as a whole.

186. By its first part, *Kṛṣṇa* reveals what is to be done by the *adhikāri* ; by its last part, he reveals what is to be done by the *upāya*,

This sloka is in two sections. By the first, Kṛṣṇa reveals the part to be done by the one is qualified *(adhikāri)* for this upāya. By the second, he reveals the part to be done by himself, the upāya, for the *adhikāri.*

To the question, "What is to be done by the *adhikāri* ?" he states :

187. What the *adhikārı* has to do is accept the *upāya*.

What the *adhikārı* must do here is accept this upāya.

"But why, rather than enjoining them, does he say to relinquish other upayas ?" To this he replies :

188. He enjoins this along with its *aṅga*.

He enjoins acceptance of this upāya along with its accessory or ancillary (*aṅga*)—that is, relinquishing other upāyas. [The śāstras] say,

> Having washed his feet, he should sip water (*ācamana*). Having bathed, he should worship as required. Having stood up, he should offer a handful of water to the sun (Bhānu). Having meditated on him, he should repeat the mantra.[2]

This means that for the *ācamana* and other such rites, one can't perform them without the footwashing, etc., which are said to be their *aṅgas* or accessories. In the same way, the gerund (*lyap*) ending on the verb [translated as "having . . ."] confirms that acceptance can't be done without relinquishing the other upāyas. Therefore, the *anuvāda* arugument is wrong. This argument maintains that [when Kṛṣṇa says] "sarva dharmān parityajya—having relinquished all dharmas," he refers to a situation which has already occured due to [Arjuna's] consideration of the difficulty [of these dharmas]; it is only then that [Kṛṣṇa] enjoins the *siddhopāya*.[3]

"But this [upāya] is desired or preferred *(rāgaprāpta)* because of its easiness, etc So does it need to be enjoined?" To this question, he replies :

189. If the desired or preferred *(rāgaprāpta) upāya* **is made obligatory this will make it readily accepted.**

Milk is desirable because of its pleasurable nature; if it is ordered to be taken as a medicine for biliousness, this will make it even more likely to be taken quickly. It is the same with this upāya, which is more desirable than other upāyas because of its excellence. If one is enjoined to accept it, this will help it to be accepted even more readily.

After this, in order to reveal its meaning word by word, he states the number of words in the first sentence :

190. The first sentence in this [mantra] has six words.

He presents its first word, "sarvadharmān," and reveals its meaning:

191. *"Sarvadharmān"*—**all dharmas.**

This compound has three parts—the word *dharma*, the plural ending, and the word *sarva*. In order to give the meaning of all three, he first presents the definition of *dharma*.

192. A dharma is something which is a means *(sādhana)* **to a result** (*phala*).

Since the word (*dharma*) extends to include sādhanas to material results, he excludes these :

193. The word *dharma* **stated here does not refer to** *sādhanas* **to material results** (*dṛṣṭaphala*) **but to** *sādhanas* **for the goal of** *mokṣa*.

When he taught the other upāyas, sādhanas to material goals were excluded The subject that is being taught here is the ways to mokṣa *(moksopāyaṅkaḷ)*. For these reasons therefore, the word *dharma* stated in this context does not include those [dharmas] that are sādhanas to material results—includig worldly goals such as sons and cattle, as well as other worldly goals such as *svarga*. Rather, it refers only to those which are sādhanas to the goal of mokṣa—attainment of the Lord.

After this, he gives the meaning of the plural ending:

194. Since these [dharmas] enjoined in *śruti* **and** *smṛti* **are many, he uses the plural ending.**

These sadhanas to the goal of mokṣa—as enjoined by the *śrutis* (which need to be explained) and the *smṛtis* (which explain them)—are many; therefore he uses the plural ending, saying "dharmān."

As to the question what these, are, he reveals :

195. These are things like: 1–3) karma, *jñāna*, **and bhaktiyoga, 4) knowledge of the secret of the Lord's incarnations, 5) knowledge of the** *Puruṣottama*, **6) living in holy places, 7) reciting the Lord's holy names, 8) lighting sacred lamps, 9) making garlands [for the Lord], etc., which are done with the thought that these are** *upāyas*.

These [dharmas], which he has previously stated to be many, include the following ;

1) Kārmayoga which is said to be an independent means [to mokṣa] *(sādhana)* in the passages, "By works alone Janaka and others attained perfection," [4] and "Therefore, always perform without attachment the work that ought to be done."[5]

2) Jñānayoga which is attaind by karma, as stated in the passages, "All such works together, O Partha, culminate in wisdom *(jñāna)*,"[6] "In this world there is no purifier equal to wisdom *(jñāna)*,"[7] and "The fire of knowledge *(jñana)*, which turns all karma to ashes."[8]

3) Bhaktiyoga, which is accompanied by karma and jñāna, as stated in the passages, "By unswerving devotion (*bhakti*) I can be known,"[9] and "Be me–minded, devoted to me."[10]

4) Knowledge of the secret of the Lord's incarnations, which is declared to be a way to first destroy all obstacles and then attain the Lord, as in the passage, "He who truly knows my divine birth and actions, does not go to another birth after relinquishing his body, Arjuna; he goes to me."[11]

5) Knowledge of the Supreme Person (*puruṣottama*) which is said to make one into "someone who has done what should be done" by granting the ultimate goal, as stated in the passage, "Knowing this, a man would become wise, having fulfilled his duties, O Bhārata."[12]

6) Living in a meritorious place, which is said to grant the aim of all desires, as in the passage, "This place grants all desires."[13]

7) Reciting the holy names [of the Lord] which is declared to result first in destruction of all sins and then in attainment of the Lord, as in the passage, "His soul purified of all sin, he goes to the eternal Brahman."[14]

8) Lighting sacred lamps which is said to be a way to first destroy sins and then attain the Lord, as in the [following] passage :

> Listen to the result of the merit of the man who lights lamps with ghee or oil for Viṣṇu as enjoined and with devotion : With all his sins destroyed, he rises to Viṣṇu's world on a shining chariot, with the countenance of a thousand suns.[15]

9) Similarly, placing sacred garlands [on the Lord's image] which is said to be a way to first destroy obstacles and then attain the Lord.

All such things which are done with the idea that they are means (*sādhanas*) are included.

After this, he reveals the meaning of the word "sarva."

196. The daily obligatory duties (*nityakarma*), **which provide qualification** (*yogyatāpādaka*) **for these particular** *sādhanas* **when one performs them, are referred to by the word "sarva."**

The various individual sadhanas are referred to in the plural by the word "sarva," modifying the word "dharma." When one performs these sadhanas, the daily obligatory duties (*nityakarma*)—such as the twilight worship (*sandhyāvandana*) and the five great sacrifices (*pañcamahāyajña*)[16]—will make one qualified (*yogya*) for those sādhanas and keep one from becoming disqualified, as stated in the passage "One omitting the twilight worship is eternally impure and unworthy of all rituals (*karma*).[17] Thus they are [also] referred to [by the word "sarva"].

He concludes what he has stated :

197. As such, it refers to karmayoga and the like which have the form of daily and occasional rites, etc. (*nityanaimittikādi*) **as enjoined in** *śruti* **and** *smṛti*.

A *dharma* is something which possesses an authoritative injunction statement which directs [one to do] it, as it is said, "Something characterized as a direction (*codanā*) is a *dharma*.[18] Thus the aforementioned dharmas refer to all the upāyas—karmayoga, etc.—which have been enjoined on the authority of

śruti and *smṛti* and which have the form of such things as daily and occasional duties.

He gives the reason why these things—which ought to be called *adharmas* since they are contrary to the soul's nature—are here called *dharmas.*

198. These are called *dharmas* because of the confused notion of Arjuna.

These things ought to be referred to by the word "*adharma*" because they are contrary to the [soul's] aim (*uddeśya*)—extreme dependence on the Lord (*bhagavadatyantapāratantrya*). But here they are called *dharmas.* This is only because Arjuna was confused, thinking that fighting—his own dharma—was *adharma* and these [upāyas] were dharmas.

Thus he has revealed the meaning of the first word. After this, he presents the second word :

199. "Parityajya"

Since this word also has three parts—the root *tyāga,* the gerund form (*lyap*), and the prefix *pari–,* he first gives the meaning of *tyāga.*

200. [The verb] *tyāga* means to consider these aforementioned *upāyas* and relinquish them with the particular attitude that says, "Like those who have conceived mother–of–pearl to be silver, or like those who have set their mind on a wrong direction, we have attributed the notion of "*upāya*" to things which are not *upāyas.*"

In this context, *tyāga* does not mean just to relinquish. It means to consider the nature of these things which have previously been called "upāyas" and relinquish them with the following particular attitude : "Like those who have conceived mother–of–pearl–which is not silver—to be silver, or like those who—wanting to go one way to do some personal business—take the wrong direction as the correct one, we who desire a means for attaining the Lord have attributed the notion of "upāya" to things which are not upāyas."

After this, he gives the meaning of the prefix *pari–*.

201. The prefix (*upasarga*) *pari–*states that, just as in giving up serious sins *(pātaka)*, one has to give these up along with the desires and tendencies [to do them again] and with shame, so that they don't occur again.

The prefix *pari–*, when taken to mean "completely" (as in the definition "*pari–* means completely") would be unnecessary, since this idea is stated in the word "sarva"; therefore it would be redundant. [So we have to interpret it otherwise.] When one gives up all those grave offenses such as "killing a brahmin, drinking liquor, stealing, cohabiting with one's teacher's wife,"[19] one relinquishes them along with the desires and tendencies which make one want to engage in them again, by becoming ashamed at the thought that one committed them. It is the same when relinquishing the other upāyas which the Lord of Dharma called sins in the following passage :

> Since you are mortally afraid of sins, [O Bhārata, don't do those things you have given up and be devoted to Nārāyaṇa][20]

So we have to relinquish them along with 1) the desire which might make us deliberately do them again, and 2) the tendencies which might make us get involved in them unintentionally. In order to make sure that we won't engage in them again, we must become ashamed, saying "I did these things which are diametrically opposed to my essential nature of having the Lord himself as my only way (*sādhana*)."

After this he reveals the meaning of the gerund form.

202. The gerund form (*lyap*) states that we have to first completely relinquish other means and then surrender, as in the statement, "Having bathed, one should take food."

The gerund form in *parityajya* is not like the statement, "Having eaten [something forbidden] perform the month–long fast (*cāndrāyana*) [as expiation]."[21] Rather, it is like the injunction

(*vidhi*) "Having bathed, one should take food." This gives an order that when one takes food, one has to first take a bath and then eat. Here, this [gerund form of *parityajya*] gives the order that when we accept the Lord as the upāya (*siddhopāya*) we must first relinquish the other upāyas which are to be given up and only then accept.[22]

He reveals the import behind this idea that we have to first relinquish and then seek refuge.

203. It says that these are not only non-*upāyas*, but impediments, as in the statement, "Shaking, the hero dropped the bow."

> The king [Rāvaṇa] was not shaken by the fall of the thunderbolt on his chest, nor did he move. But when struck by Rāma's arrow, he became agitated. Shaking, the hero dropped the bow.[23]

Rāvaṇa, overwhelmed by Rāma's archery, became agitated and tried to escape. But as long as he held the bow, Rāma did not allow him to leave. The bow which he eventually dropped was not an effective means *(sādhana)* for conquering his enemy while he was holding it. Not only that, but the permission Rāma later gave him, saying "I will let you go,"[24] was not given during the time he was holding the bow. Thus [the bow] can be said to be an impediment which kept him from leaving. In the same way, if there remains even the slightest involvement in these other upāyas, they will not only fail to be effective means (*upāya*) to the goal, they will actully turn out to be obstructions to the ultimate attainment.

Using an example, he further reveals how engaging in these makes for loss.

204 As with the emperor, these make for loss.

The emperor [Daśaratha] lost the fortune he had—living with Rāma who is said to be the dharma incarnate[25]—by clinging to the dharma of truthfulness, which was only a semblance [of dharma] (*ābhāsamāna*), thinking that he could not refuse to

honor a vow he had previously granted. In the same way, remaining engaged in the other illusory means (*ābhāsamāna upāyāntaraṅkaḷ*) will certainly make for loss of the great fortune of living with the divine being (*bhagavadviṣaya*), the eternal dharma himself, declared to be "Kṛṣṇa, the eternal dharma."[26]

After this, in order to respond to the fault pointed out by those ignorant of the true intention of the command to relinquish all dharmas, he brings up their argument.

205. Some argue that by saying to relinquish all dharmas, ***adharmas*** **will enter.**

The dharmas which are to be rejected consist of injunctions and prohibitions saying "do this" and "don't do that." Therefore, when the statement to relinquish all dharmas throws out the avoidance of prohibited actions along with the performance of injunctions, then the performance of prohibited actions will enter in, just as some vile creature [like a dog] will enter [a house] if a door is left open. Such is the argument some people make. But he refutes this as incorrect :

206. This is wrong, since it does not say to do ***adharmas.***

The assertion that *adharmas* will enter does not follow from the statement to relinquish all dharmas, since it does not say to do *adharmas* but merely to relinquish dharmas.

But since refraining from *adharmas* is implied by the word *dharma*, if he says to relinquish dharmas, isn't it implied that one should do *adharmas* ? [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] states the view of the opponent :

207. If it be argued that this is stated automatically, . . .

He reveals the answer to this :

208. . . [we reply that] it is not, because the word dharma does not indicate refraining from ***adharmas.***

It is not correct to say that this statement to relinquish dharmas automatically says to "do *adharmas*." This is because

the word *dharma* generally does not mean refraining from *adharmas*. Rather, it refers primarily to prescribed actions which are accompanied by ancillaries (*aṅga*) such as refraining from *adharmas*.

Even if the word *dharma* does not primarily refer to refraining from *adharmas*, doesn't the fact that it is modified by the word *sarva* necessarily imply this ? To this he reveals :

209. Even if that is so, [here] it means something other than that.

Even if it can mean that, it does not mean that in this context. Thus, it refers only to these dharmas in the form of prescribed actions and not to [refraining from *adharmas*].[27]

On what grounds is this declared ? To this he says :

210. If one looks at oneself, the Lord, and the goal, there is no way for these to enter.

Performance of *adharmas* is disliked by the Lord who is the *śeṣī*. The soul's nature [as a *śeṣa*] is such that it is inappropriate for him to do what the Lord dislikes, but only to do what he likes. Thus if one looks at oneself, there is no way for these to enter.

Because of his intolerance of connection with other aids, the Lord is the upāya who cannot put up with any kind of activity on the part of the soul other than cessation from self-effort (*svayatna-nivṛtti*). If one looks at such a Lord, there is no way for these to enter.

The ultimate goal of the soul's activity is the Lord's pleasure. If one looks at such a goal, there is no way for these to enter.

Thus there is no way for these *adharmas*—which are obstacles to all three—to enter. Therefore, even if the word *dharma* can mean refraining from *adharmas*, we have to take it as saying something other than that here. This is the import.

After this he presents the third word, "mām," and reveals its meaning.

211. "*Mām*"—me, the one who is 1) the savior of all, 2) your menial servant, 3) awaiting your acceptance, 4) accepting your sins with relish, 5) your refuge, 6) the one who protects, refusing to leave even if—like [naturally] cool water [spontaneously] heating up—the one who unites [Laksmi] wants to separate [us].

"Mām" means me, the one who is dedicated *(dīkṣita)* to the protection of everyone, such that there is no need to doubt, "Will he save me? Or won't he?"

Me, your menial servant who undertakes whatever you command, as when you say "Stop the chariot in the midst of both armies." [28] Thus there is no need to wonder, "Seeing his greatness and my punyness, will he associate with me?"

Me, the one who, out of my eagerness to save you, await the consent of you—the one to be protected—as stated [in the following passage] :

> Even though he is all knowing, the Lord of all, ever merciful, since he is the one who supports the system of saṁsāra, waits for a request for protection. [29]

Me, the one who accepts with relish the faults of you whose mind is confused about right and wrong action (*dharmādharma-dhiyākulaṉ*), with misplaced affection and pity. For this reason, you need not fear that I will scorn you upon seeing your faults.

Me, the refuge of all who are without protection *(aśaraṇya-śaraṇya)* am a refuge such that you and others who lack support can take shelter.

Water's nature is to be cool ; but it just might happen to heat up [on its own]. [Similarly] the one who is the mediator *(puruṣakāra)* [Lakṣmī]—who joins [souls to the Lord] and allows for the forgiveness of sins—just may find fault and try to separate [the soul and the Lord]. But as [Pĕriyāḻvār] said, "Even if the lotus lady herself proclaims [the soul's] sins," I [the Lord] will be unable to leave [the cetana] and will refute [any fault], saying "My

devotees would never do that."[30] This "mām" means me, the one who will side with [the soul] in this way and protect him.

He reveals what is excluded by the fact that "mām" refers to this incarnation *(vibhavarūpa)* [of the Lord].

212. This word excludes his *para* and *vyūha* [forms] and his status as the inner controller (*antaryāmi*) of the gods.

Since the "mām" refers to himself, the one who incarnated as an object of vision, standing near as one who can be beseeched, this excludes his supreme (*para*) and evolutionary (*vyūha*) forms which are impossible to see or approach because of their remoteness. It also excludes the Lord's status as the inner controller (*antaryāmi*) of the gods—Agni, Indra, etc.—where he lacks any such exclusive form, though [this *antaryāmi* form] is indicated for those who are established in other upāyas.[31]

He reveals a special meaning which results from telling [Arjuna] to resort to him after having relinquished all dharmas :

213. He who took birth in order to establish dharma, by saying "relinquish all dharmas and resort to me" declares that the actual (*sākṣāt*) dharma is himself alone.

"In order to establish dharma, I am born in each yuga,"[32] Thus [Kṛṣṇa] declares that he was born in order to establish dharma. When he says that in order to attain himself one must relinquish all dharmas which are established in the śāstras as sādhanas to mokṣa ("sarva dharmān parityajya") and resort to him, he is declaring that these are not the real (*sākṣāt*) dharmas. The actual (*sākṣāt*) dharma which is to be established is, as it is said, "Kṛṣṇa, the eternal dharma"[33] that is, the Lord himself, the eternal dharma.

He states what this means :

214. This states [his] superiority over the relinquished *sādhanas*.

This statement declares the superiority that this sādhana has compared to the previously relinquished sādhanas.

He explains what that is :

215. That is, [this *sādhana*] is accomplished (*siddha*), supremely cognizant (*paramacetana*), all-powerful (*sarvaśakti*), free from danger (*nirapāya*), rightful and proper (*prāpta*), and without need for other aids (*sahāyāntaranirapekṣa*).

Thus the excellence of this [sādhana, the Lord himself] in comparison to the previousy relinquished sādhanas is that it is :

1) accomplished (*siddha*), because he is the eternal dharma, and does not depend on human action to be achieved ;

2) supremely cogizant, because he is all-knowing, as stated in such texts as, "[He] who is all-knowing, all-wise ;"[34]

3) all-powerful, as it is said, "His innate power is known to be of a varied nature and supreme : knowledge, strength, and action.[35]

4) without danger, for since he is an already accomplished entity, there is no opportunity for any risky event to intervene, as [there would be in the case of] something which the cetana has to do.

5) rightful and proper (*prāpta*), since he will never be inappropriate for the essential nature of the soul who is dependent [on him] ;

6) without need for other aids, because of his aforementioned qualities of supreme cognizance, etc.

He gives the reasons for the Lord's lack of need for other aids by the next three sentences :

216. The other *upāyas*, since they are things that need to be accomplished, depend on the cetana to complete them. Since [those *upāyas*] are insentient and powerless, they depend on the Lord to accomplish their results (*kāryasiddhi*). Since this *upāya* is diametrically opposed to those, it has no need for them.

Since the upāyas apart from this one are accomplished by the cetana's activity, they depend on the cetana who performs action

to complete them. Those upāyas are insentient and powerless, without the capacity either to know what it is that the soul needs to do or to carry it out successfully. Therefore, in order to accomplish their results—attaining what the soul desires and getting rid of what he dislikes (*iṣtāniṣṭaprāptiparihāra*)— [those upāyas] depend on the Lord who possesses the omnipotence used in granting the results (*phala*) [of all action], as declared [in the *Brahmā Sūtras*], "The result is from him; therefore it is fitting."[36] This upāya, because of its supreme intelligence and omnipotence, is oppossed to those; therefore, it has no need for the others.

After this, he shows how all those special qualities which facilitate resorting [to the Lord] shine forth in this word :

217. In this [word "*mām*"] the special qualities of affection (*vātsalya*) lordliness (*svāmitva*), affability (*sauśīlya*) and accessibility (*saulabhya*) shine forth clearly (*nerāka prakāśikkiṟatu*).

Without minding the defects of Arjuna, who had refrained from dharma because he thought it to be *adharma*, the Lord revealed to him the truths he needed. Thus his affection (*vātsalya*) is manifested. By not only speaking of his supremacy many times, but actually making Arjuna see it, he manifested his lordliness (*svāmitva*). When Arjuna himself said, "Hey, Kṛṣṇa! Hey, Yādava;"[37] the Lord interacted with him, thus manifesting his affability (*sauśīlya*). He made his holy form—which is supernatural—into an object of vision, thus manifesting his accessibility (*saulabhya*). [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] calls these "special qualities" in order to show that these are necessary for resorting [to Him]. The pharse "nerāka prakāśikkiṟatu" means that they shine forth clearly.

Among all these, accessibility (*saulabhya*) is most necessary; therefore, he reveals not only the accessibility which results from his taking birth (*avatāra*), but also how he manifests supreme accessibility in his form as a charioteer.

218. [The word] "*mam*" points to his form as a charioteer, standing with whip in hand, holding the reins, his holy hair greyed with dust from the [passing] armies, his holy feet hanging down below the chariot.

When he says "me," this points to his form as a charioteer, standing with whip held in his holy hand in order to prod and drive the horses, the reins held tight in order to turn them right and left and stop them, his holy hair made dusty from the dirt raised by the army, standing without any covering on his holy head, and with his holy feet adorned with small bells hanging down beneath the chariot, as described [by Nammāḻvār], "The tinkling feet of the Lord who drives the chariot."[38]

Thus he has revealed the meaning of the third word. After this, he presents the fourth word, "ekam."

219. "Ekam"

He gives its meaning :

220. This word "ekam", on the strength of its position, indicates exclusivity.

Words meaning exclusivity are used in many passages where this particular upāya is stated. Thus, like the letter *u* [of the Tirumantra], this word "ekam" also gives the meaning of exclusivity.

As examples, he reveals a number of statements in which words indicating exclusivity are used after references to this upāya.

221. In the same way it is said, "Those who resort to me alone,"[39] "That Primal Person alone,"[40] "You alone be my *upāya*"[41] "You have given me your feet alone as a way and a refuge,"[42]

"Those who resort to me alone" means "Those few people who do prapatti to me alone." "I resort to that Primal Person alone" means "I resort to that Puruṣa, the primordial one,"

"You alone be my upāya" means "I request that you alone be my upāya." "You have given me your feet alone as a way and a refuge" means "In place of other upāyas you gave me your holy feet alone as an upāya." In these texts, after referring to the one who is to be accepted, [a word] indicating exclusivity is used (*māmeva*, tam*eva*, tvam*eva*, niṉpātam*e*). It is the same here.

As to what this word excludes, he says :

222. By this [word] the acceptance stated in "vraja" is excluded from being the upaya.

The fault of redundancy would occur if this only excluded other upāyas. And, if it is taken to exclude other deities, that too has already been established by the reference to his unique form in the word "mām." Therefore, he says that this meaning of exclusivity removes *upāyatva* from the acceptance stated further on in the word "vraja". It would be possible to infer that this acceptance itself is a sādhana, based on positive and negative concomitance [that is, based on the fact that salvation is seen only in conjunction with acceptance]. For this reason, [acceptance] must be explicity excluded from being a sādhana.

Since this upāya will not be efficacious without subsequent acceptance, acceptance is absolutely necessary, So how can *upāyatva* be excluded in this case ? To this question, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] replies ;

223. Even acceptance itself has come from him alone.

After acceptance, this [goal of] destroying what the soul does not want and making him attain his desire comes about from the Lord alone. In the same way, the very acceptance which precedes this also comes about from him alone. Thus it is said that acceptance is not the upāya but an effect of the upāya.

As to how [the Lord] brings this about, he reveals.

224. It is the fruit of the labor (*kṛṣiphala*) he put forth through creation, the *avatāras*, etc.[43]

When the soul was lying bereft of limbs and organs, without either experience [of saṁsāra] or release [from it], indistinguishable from insentient matter, the Lord created him to be endowed with limbs and organs, such that he has expansive consciousness. Then, as it is said, "Coming toward and surrounding,"[44] the Lord incarnated many times in order to accept the soul. When he took birth in this way, [the Lord] exhibited his [divine] qualities and deeds, inspiring [the soul's] trust and desire to submit to him. Thus this acceptance has resulted from the efforts he made in this way.

He cites an authority for this idea :

225. "That too is but his sweet grace.,"[45]

"In order to reach by his grace the Lord of those supreme in wisdom, I placed him in my mind." [Nammāḷvār here says]" In order to obtain, by his grace, the one who is the sole commander of the being and activity of the eternally free souls *(nityasūrikaḷ)* who possess supreme wisdom, I kept him before my desiring mind." But after thus referring to his own acceptance [of the Lord] he states, "That too is but his sweet grace," meaning that this very acceptance came about only by the Lord's spontaneous grace (*nirhetukakṛpā*). Therefore we have to take it that acceptance, too, is the fruit of his labor (*kṛṣiphala*).

Such being the case, he says that one must think of this acceptance as worthless *(carakkaṟa)* :

226. One should think that even without it, he would do the work.

Since the Lord is the one who has done the labor even for this acceptance, we must bear in mind that it is not on account of it that the Lord is doing the work [of salvation] for us; even without it, the one who is the cause of the soul's very life would do the work of getting rid of what we dislike and granting our desire.

Why is it necessary to think this way? To this he replies;

227. Otherwise, [the Lord's] lack of need for [other] ***upāyas (upāyanairapekṣya)*** **won't be maintained.**

If, rather than thinking that the work would be done even without it, we suppose that this [acceptance] is also needed in order for him to do the work, then this upāya's lack of need for other aids will not be maintained.

"But then just what is the nature of this acceptance ?" To this he says ;

228. This [acceptance] is : in order to resolve the problem of everyone being released ***(sarvamuktiprasaṅga)*****, for the purpose of mental peace, an effect of sentience (*****caitanyakārya*****), done voluntarily (*****rāgaprāpta*****), established in the soul's nature, a demonstration of non–rejection.**

This acceptance is a way to remove the *sarvamuktiprasaṅga* which states that since there is nothing required on our part when the Lord brings about salvation (*ujjīvippi–*), everyone should be released [from saṁsāra].[46] It is a way to bring peace of mind [to the cetana] and keep him from being disturbed by wondering, "What is the basis for thinking that the one who has not saved us for so long will save us today?". Since the soul is sentient and not insentient, the resolution that the Lord alone is the upāya is an effect of that intelligence. Rather than being obligatory, this acceptance is done voluntarily by the soul cognizant of its delightfulness. It is not at variance with the soul's nature but is firmly established in that nature—as one who is to be protected by him alone *(tadekaraksyatvarūpamāṉa svarūpa)*. From time immemorial the soul has been rejecting the protection the Lord offers by trying to protect himself. This acceptance shows that he has given that up.

After this he reveals what the Lord does prior to the word "mām" and what he does here.

229. Previously he removed the condition of "himself and others"; here he removes the condition of "himself and the soul."

When he said "sarva dharmān parityajya" he said to release all upāyas, thereby removing the condition of himself—who grants all results—being associated with other upāyas. When he said "ekam" he removed *upāyatva* from [the soul's] acceptance, thereby removing the condition of himself—the upāya—[operating jointly with] the soul who thinks that his own acceptance is an upāya. He uses a personal form for "others" (*piṟar*) just as [Nammāḷvār] did when he said, "from anyone (*yāvarālum*) but you." [47]

After this he reveals what is wrong with acceptance which is thought of as a sādhana.

230. The soul seeking refuge with the Lord contains egoism (*ahaṅkāra*) and brings discredit.

When [the soul], the one who is to be protected, accepts [the Lord], the one who is the unconditional protector, for the sake of [the soul's] own protection—such acceptance contains egoism by having agency located in oneself (*svakartṛtvarūpāhaṅkāragarbha*). Thus it brings discredit, much like a son who gets a written contract from his father [to protect him]. [48]

But then just what is the protection ? To this he says :

231. His [the Lord's] acceptance is the protection.

Acceptance where the one whose obligation is to protect the soul says "Let us save him" and lovingly takes him—this alone is ultimately what protects the soul.

In order to make it clear that this upāya tolerates nothing by way of the cetana's activity, he reveals what distinguishes this upāya from other upāyas.

232. For other *upāyas*, refraining from action (*nivṛtti*) is a fault; for this one, action (*pravṛtti*) is a fault.

Upāyas other than than this one—the accomplished upāya (*siddhopāya*)—are fulfilled by the cetana's activity (*pravṛtti*) ; thus

it is a fault if the cetana refrains from making his own efforts *(svayatnanivṛtti)*. This upāya, however, is intolerant of association with other aids. Therefore, with it the only fault would be the cetana's activity.

He cites an authority for declaring that no activity of the cetana is needed :

233. "Don't trouble yourself (*ciṟṟa veṇṭā*) **!"**[49]

The hymn which begins "There is nothing else . . . " refers to acceptance of the *siddhopāya* when it says, "Don't trouble yourself" ; this means that it is not necessary to do any elaborate action. Thus [Nammāḷvār] declares that one engaged in this upāya must not do any activity [to reach the Lord].

He says that this idea has already been stated in this very śloka :

234. Cessation has been stated previously.

This was stated previously in "sarva dharmān parityajya," where he said that the soul has to desist from all activity.

But isn't thankfulness (lit., remembrance of help, *upakārasmṛti*) necessary? Isn't that part of the upāya? To this he says :

235. Thankfulness also comes from [the soul's] intelligence ; it is not contained in the *upāya*.

Even the recognition and gratitude (*upakārasmṛti*) which the soul expresses to the upāya by such statements as "You destroyed my evil mind," [50] and "you gave me the mind to approach and worship you,"[51] are only products of his consciousness (*caitanya*). It is not at all because of the presence of such recognition that the Lord does the work. Thus it is not included in the upāya.

Thus he has revealed the fourth word. After this he presents the fifth word, "śaraṇam," and its meaning :

236. *"Śaraṇam"*—as an *upāya.*

He reveals that even though this word is capable of other meanings, in this context it means only *upāya*, giving the reason why.

237. Even though this word *"śaraṇam"* can mean protector, house, or *upāya*, in this context it means only *upāya*, since it must be connected with the foregoing.

As it is said [in Pāñcarātra], "The word *śaraṇam* means upāya, house or protector; but this indicates appropriately only upāya."[52] Thus this word "śaraṇam" can mean protector, house, and upāya, but in this context it means only upāya. This is because the topic under discussion is relinquishing all dharmas and resorting to the Lord, and this word must be connected with what has gone before.

But since the aforementioned relinquishing of other sādhanas makes it clear that the upāya is the one who is accepted [the Lord], is the use of the word "śaraṇam" necessary ? Yes, it is necessary. This is because relinquishing other upāyas is not only found at the time of procuring a means (*prāpakasamaya*) but also at the time of attainment of the final goal (*prāpyasamaya*), as when one relinquishes a boat after crossing a river. Even though this situation is a case of the former [procuring a means, not attaining the goal], acceptance by itself is not enough to make that distinction clear. [53]

Can't it be argued that since the relinquishing of other means is enjoined as an ancillary (*aṅga*) of accceptance, this demonstrates that [the Lord who] is to be accepted is the upāya ; thus there is no purpose in using the word "śaraṇam"? No, this cannot be said, for it is appropriate to say something explicitly rather than just letting it be implied by the meaning. Didn't Rāmānuja say, "Since it is quite comprehensible, that which is clearly stated is preferable to that which is inferred by reasoning." [54]

So, since the Lord is to be accepted as the goal (*prāpya*) and also as the means to the goal (*prāpaka*), the word "śaraṇa" here—

meaning upāya—distinguishes this [acceptance as the means] from acceptance as the goal.

After this he presents the sixth word, "vraja," and its meaning:

238. "Vraja"—think (*buddhipaṇṇu*).

He clarifies this :

239. Since [verbs] meaning motion [also can] mean thought, this says, "resolve - firmly."

The root vraj-means to go, and there is a rule, "gatyarthā buddhyarthāḥ," which says that words indicating motion can also mean thought. Therefore he says this means "resolve firmly."

> This kind of thinking is a special cognition consisting of firm resolve, one which : 1) lies outside the category of the things to be abandoned, 2) is not included in the category of the upāya, 3) is preceded by relinquishing other means (*prāpakāntara*), 4) consists of consenting to the Lord's protection, 5) is an effect of [the soul's] sentience, 6) implies a prayer, 7) causes the Lord to rejoice, 8) is in accord with the soul's essential nature, 9) is without [the possibility] of going astray or delaying.[55]

The above, which [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] revealed in his *Parantapati*, should be contemplated in this context.

Since this verb of motion can refer equally to mental, verbal and physical activity, why is it restricted here to firm resolve which is mental ? To this he replies :

240. Even though verbal and physical [performance] are expected for this, since moksa is from knowledge, it means mental performance.

As [Nammāḷvār] says, "by thought, word, and deed",[56] acceptance which comes about by the agency of all three is a factor in fulfilment of the qualification (adhikārapūrti) [for this

acceptance].[57] Thus verbal acceptance (words expressing choosing [of the upāya]), and physical acceptance (folding one's hands, etc.) are necessary for this acceptance. However, it is said that mokṣa is from knowledge (jnānāt mokṣa)[58]; therefore this indicates only mental performance, to the exclusion of the other two. Thus he has revealed the word-by-word meaning [of the first part].

After this he concludes by stating the meaning of the first half [of the Caramaśloka]:

241. Thus, having stated 1) what is to be relinquished. 2) the way in which it is to be relinquished. 3) the *upāya* to which one resorts. 4) the self-sufficiency of the *upāya* (*upāyanairapekṣya*), 5) [his] status as the *upāya* (*upāyatva*), this states 6) the acceptance of the *upāya*.

Thus, the first half [of the Caramaśloka] states 1) that which is to be relinquished, saying "sarva dharmān," 2) the method of relinquishing, saying "parityajya," 3) the upāya to which one resorts, saying "mām," 4) this upāya's self-sufficiency (nairapekṣya), saying "ekam," 5) [his] status as the upāya, saying "śaraṇam," and then 6) the acceptance of the upāya. saying "vraja."

Then, with the intention to reveal the meaning of the second half [of the Caramaśloka] he presents its first word :

242. "Aham"—I.

He says that in the second half the Lord reveals the part he does :

243. He reveals what is to be done by himself.

What is to be done by the *adhikāri* has been stated in the first half; what is to be done by himself—the upāya—is revealed in this half.

After this, he gives the meaning of this word :

244. I—the one who is all-knowing, all-powerful, and proper.

I—the one who knows all, as stated [in the Upaniṣad], "Who is all knowing, all wise,"[59] the one who has all power, as stated [in the Upaniṣad], "His manifold, supreme power is to be proclaimed,"[60] and the one who is worthy and proper *(prāpta)* by virtue of being the *śeṣī*.

He reveals why it is that, though there are other qualities, this word "aham" points to these particular qualities.

245. This points to 1) the particular qualities which are especially for the purpose *(ekānta)* of a) knowing the soul's prior condition and future path and b) successfully acting in accord with that knowledge, and 2) the special relationship *(bandhaviśeṣa)* which allows [the Lord] to successfully accomplish that for his own gain.

This displays his particular attributes of omniscience and omnipotence as employed when he grants the soul's desire and destroys what he does not want. These attributes allow him to know the soul's past condition and how that soul must proceed in the future, as well as to successfully bring about [the desired condition] in accord with that knowledge. This [word] also displays the special relationship of being the *śeṣī*, which allows him to bring all this about not for the soul's sake but for his own benefit. Just as when he said "mām" he pointed to the particular qualities especially for the purpose *(ekānta)* of taking refuge with him, so also when he says "aham" he points to the particular qualities unique to successfully doing the work [of saving the soul] *(kāryakaratva)*. If [the Lord] has no accessibility, etc., one can't take refuge; similarly, without knowledge, power, etc., successfully completing the work [of salvation] would be impossible. In this context the word ["aham"]—referring to knowledge, power, and propriety or worthiness *(jñāna, śakti, prāpti)*—also implies perfection *(pūrti)*.

He states that in this word, the Lord manifests his autonomy *(svātantrya)* which contrasts with his dependence *(pāratantrya)* in his charioteer-form when he said "mām."

246. The word "aham" indicates his real state; this put an end to the fear that Arjuna felt upon seeing the charioteer-form, which [the Lord] took on for his sake, from his own standpoint and not from the Lord's standpoint.

When [Kṛṣṇa] said "mām," he said to resort to himself in his charioteer-form. Arjuna did not see this charioteer-form—which the Lord took upon himself for the sake of [Arjuna's own] protection—from the Lord's perspective ; [that is, he did not see him as] the supreme Lord stooping down like this simply out of his power and virtue. Rather, he saw [the charioteer-form] from his own perspective, thinking, "Isn't he just the one who acts as my charioteer and menial servant ? He says to relinquish all dharmas and resort to him. Where would this end up?". To remove this fear [Kṛṣṇa] says "aham," manifesting his form as it truly is—with unconstrained autonomy *(niraṅkuśasvātantrya)* by virtue of his being the independent and self-reliant controller of the nature and existence of the material realm and the three kinds of sentient beings. [61]

He reveals that since [the Lord] is of such a nature, even if he becomes dependent on another, that is not his essential nature *(svarūpa)*.

247. Even his previous dependence *(pāratantrya)* **is but the culmination of this independent autonomy** *(svātantrya)*.

Even his previous dependence as a charioteer is but the extreme limit of this independent autonomy which is such that when he carries out his own will, there is no one to prevent him.

After this, he presents the second word "tvā" and its meaning:

248. ***Tvā*****—you who, being ignorant, unable, and unworthy** *(ajña, aśakta, aprāpta)*, **have resorted to me as an** ***upāya*****.**

This means : you who lack the wisdom to know how to do the work [of saving] yourself; you who—even if you did know—lack the ability to do it successfully; you who—even if you were able—do not have the right *(prāpti)* to save yourself; you who,

in light of this, have relinquished all dharmas and taken me alone as an upāya which needs nothing else (*nirapeksopāya*).

After this he presents the third word, "sarvapāpebhyo." Since it has three parts—the word *pāpa*, the plural ending, and the word *sarva,* he gives the meaning of this word incorporating all three.

249. *"Sarvapāpebhyo."* **You are afraid that some of your various sins will be obstacles to attaining me ; from all of those sins.**

The word *pāpa* means whatever obstructs gaining one's desire and is a cause for something undesired. Since the context is mokṣa, here obstacles to gaining one's desire are obstacles to attainment of the Lord. Here, the obstacles to the knowledge *(jñāna)* [of the Lord], desire *(ruci)* [to attain him], and the means *(upāya)* [to do so] have already been destroyed. What remains thereafter are obstacles to final attainment. Therefore, he says, you are afraid of whatever few sins there are which would prevent attaining me. This word means "from each and every one of those sins".

He reveals the meaning of the plural ending :

250. As in the passage, "False knowledge, wicked character, and foul body," [62] **this means ignorance (*avidyā*), actions (*karma*), karmic tendencies (*vāsanā*), desires (*ruci*), and attachment to the material realm (*prakṛtisambandha*).**

[Nammāḻvār] said, "False knowledge, wicked character, and a foul body," thus referring to 1) conceiving the soul to be an entity made of insentient matter, and thus capable of being described by the word *asatya*—unreal or false—since [matter] comes into being and is destroyed, 2) engaging in wicked, worldly actions (*sāṁsārikaduṣkarma*) on account of confusing the body and the soul in this way, 3) connection with an impure body consisting of flesh, blood, etc. which necessarily results from [those actions (*karma*). According to this statement, these [obstructions] are *avidyā*, *karma*, *vāsanā*, *ruci*, and *prakṛtisambandha*—ignorance, actions, karmic tendencies, desires, and attachment to matter.

Of these, "avidyā" refers to the three types of ignorance : absence of knowledge *(jñānānudaya)*, somewhat perverse knowledge (*anyathājñāna*), and completely contrary knowledge (*viparīta-jñāna*). "Karma" refers to merits and sins (*puṇya, pāpa*), for, with regard to mokṣa, merit as well as sin is to be rejected. Indeed it is said, "Rejecting merit and sin, [the wise man devoid of passion, thus attains equality with the Divine]."[63] "Vāsanā" refers to tendencies towards ignorance, karma, and attachment to matter. "Ruci" or desires are many, according to the objects desired. "Prakṛtisambandha," means attachment to insentient matter, both gross and subtle.

After this, he reveals the import of the "sarva."

251. Those [obstructions] which follow from natural tendencies (*prakṛtivāsanā*) like shredding grass and scratching, those done out of fear of the world's scorn, out of compassion, or out of confusion—all these things are referred to.

All the following are referred to here :

1) Those later misdeeds which follow unintentionally out of natural tendencies, from such things as [mindlessly] shredding grass to scratching where it itches.

2) The daily and occasional duties (*nityanaimittikakarma*) which are done out of fear, saying "If I don't do them, people will reproach me."

3) Such duties done out of mercy, thinking "Alas, if people see me omitting these, they will [imitate me and] be destroyed."[64]

4) Things done when confused by *rajas* or *tamas*, such as engaging in the abandoned upāyas or doing prapatti again.

He raises a doubt and reveals that even things not done with the idea that they are sādhanas are included in the category of sādhana because of their outcome.

252. There is no need to wonder whether, like a madman's perambulations which lead him to a village, these are to be included in the rejected *upāyas*. [They certainly are.]

A madman is defined as one who has a mental delusion.[65] Suppose one who has such a delusion travels along some path without any idea of going anywhere in particular; if the path leads to a certain place, he will arrive there. In the same way, might it be that these things done out of fear of the world's scorn, etc., even without the idea that they are sādhanas, are to be included with the rejected upāyas ? There is no need to wonder about this. That is, they certainly are included. "Even if one performs them primarily out of compassion, these too will have their results, just as a lump of dirt thrown high will not remain in the air. Therefore, these must also be referred to by the word *pāpa*.[66] Thus [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] has revealed in his *Taṉicaramam*.

Be that as it may, what is the fault of doing prapatti again ? To this he says.

253. Even prapatti done in confusion, with the idea that it is an *upāya*, is equivalent to a sin.

Prapatti does not tolerate repeated performance—it is done once-and-for-all. Prapatti done again, by one confused or ignorant of its nature, with the idea that it is a means to get rid of what is unwanted or to attain a desire, is equivalent to an offense just like the other upāyas. As it is said : "Since you are mortally afraid of sins, [O Bhārata, don't do those things you have given up and be devoted to Nārāyaṇa]."[67]

After this, he presents the fourth word, "mokṣayiṣyāmi" and its meaning :

254. "*Mokṣayisyāmi*"—I will make it so that you are released.

This means, "I will make it so that you are freed from these"

After this, he reveals the meaning of the causal form [of this verb].

255. The causal form (*ṇic*) indicates that neither you nor I need [do anything] ; they will disappear automatically (*taṉṉataiye*).

By the causal ending "-yiṣyāmi" the Lord reveals, "I myself will not be the active agent (*svayamkartā)* but the instigating agent *(prayojakakartā)* who will cause you to be released. Therefore, I don't have to make any effort for this. Nor do you have to ask for it. Because of the grandeur of that royal lineage [you have gained] by submitting to me, upon seeing you they will be afraid and will soon be, as it is said, "Gone away with wind ! Disappeared !"[68] That is, they will spontaneously leave and go away, such that no one can know how they left.

He clarifies the import of what he has revealed in this way :

256. That is, can the things which have come about as a result of my disfavor remain if I become gracious ?

Sins are not things which rise up [spontaneously] like a castor plant out of a garbage heap, and bite one on the throat like a snake ; [that is, they are not visible]. Since the actions a cetana performs vanish in an instant, they are destroyed at that very moment. Even the one who did them, out of his ignorance, will simply forget. But the inherently omniscient one, who remains cognizant of all, omitting nothing, at the proper time and without fail, will weigh [those actions] and cause [the cetana] to experience [their results]. So, this means, "Can those things which have come about as a result of my disfavor remain with you any longer once I have graciousness or favor (*anugraha*)—the opposite of disfavor (*nigraha*)—toward you ?"

He reveals the main idea in saying that they will go away automatically.

257. I will make these very sins experience the sufferings you have endured from time immemorial because of them.

Since time immemorial sins bearing miseries have come and overwhelmed you, making you tremble to see them. I will make it so that these very sins will tremble, their bowels burning, when

they see you endowed with the grandeur of the royal lineage of those who have taken me as a refuge.

> Making them go away spontaneously implies that they go away so completely that they do not seem like something which we previously possessed and then lost. That is, even if they are remembered, in the light of our true nature (*svābhāvikaveṣa*), it will seem as if they were like dreams which came upon us and then passed away. No misery will follow from remembering them. [69]

This which [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] himself revealed in his *Taṉicaramam* ought to be contemplated in this context.

He reveals a meaning implied in the first person form of "mokṣayiṣyāmi" :

258 **After this I will not give you up, even into your own hands. Won't I myself remove the dirt from my own body ?**

"You have been wandering around for all this time thinking that you are capable of doing your own work [of salvation], so I just thought, 'He is doing his own work.' Now that you have realized that you are my *śeṣa*, like my own body, and have cast your burden on me, I will not give you up into your own hands and tell you to make your own efforts to remove your sins. Won't I myself—the body-bearer (*śarīri*)—remove the dirt of ignorance from you who are my body (*śarīra*) ?" The statement, "Won't I myself remove the dirt from my own body" is made to show that both the effort and the benefit (*yatnaphalitva*) are the Lord's. Thus this says, "None of your obstructions will remain."

Since the desired result is both destruction of obstacles and attainment of the desired goal, why did he state only one ? This is because if one is said, the other is automatically implied: therefore [the latter] has not been stated. It might be argued that it is not stated because this upāya has no other result than that stated for the preceding upāyas, given as "You will reach me." [70] If so, then why does he refer to destruction of obstacles? This is because

[destruction of obstacles] is greater. If the obstacles are destroyed, the result is attianed automatically ; thus there is no need to state it separately. In this context, the objections and refutations he has presented concisely in his *Śriyaḥpatippaṭi Rahasya*, and elaborately in his *Parantapati* and *Taṉicaramam*, should be reflected upon.

After this he presents the last phrase, "mā śucaḥ," and gives its meaning :

259. "*Mā śucaḥ*"—This says, "Since you are not involved (*adhikāri-*) in doing your own work [of salvation], and since I am undertaking your work, you see that there is no basis for your grief." Thus he causes [Arjuna's] grief to be dispelled.

"If you were involved in doing your own work [of salvation] it might be proper for you to languish and grieve, saying "What do I have to do [to be saved]?" If I had not undertaken your work, it would be proper to grieve, saying 'He is indifferent toward my work [of salvation]. How am I going to be saved?' But such is not the case. "Realizing your essential dependence (*svarūpa-pāratantrya*) which is such that neither the effort nor benefit [of your salvation] belongs to you, you have not involved yourself in doing the work of saving yourself. I am [your] Lord and owner (*svāmi*) such that both the effort and benefit in your salvation belong to me ; and I have taken the responsiblity of doing the work of saving you by cutting off all the obstructions on your side. Therefore, you see, there is no basis for you to be grieved." Saying this, the Lord causes the grief of the one who was previously over-whelmed with grief to be dispelled.

Thus [Piḷḷai Lokācarya] has revealed how the Lord removes grief by explaining the nature of the two individuals—the protector and the one to be protected—with the words "aham" and "tvā."

Hereafter, he reveals how [the Lord] removes grief by referring to the nature of the sins to be removed and the one who removes them.

260. After declaring the nature of the destroyer, and after saying "The things to be destroyed will not come and overwhelm you [again]," he says, "See, there is indeed no cause for you to grieve."

He has stated the nature of the destroyer of obstacles as being endowed with the qualities of omniscience, etc. in the "aham."

By the causal form in the phrase, "tvā sarva pāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi," he has stated, "The sins which are to be destroyed will run away in fright upon seeing you. Now that you have accepted me alone as an upāya, they will not come again to overwhelm you."

Then, with "mā śucaḥ," he says, "After all this, there is no basis for your grief

Here, using a statement of the wise [Āḻvār] as an illustration, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] shows how the Lord declares his intention to remove [the soul's] obstacles and thus dispells his grief.

261. "O poor heart, why do you immerse yourself in an ocean of misery,"[71] he says.

Tirumaḻicai Pirāṉ, speaking to his heart, tells how the Lord of all, in order to destroy all the [the soul's] obstacles and take him as a servant, voluntarily came and entered him; thus he says, "After this, why should you be sunk in a sea of misery ?" In the same way, the Lord also, in this place, tells how he has taken it upon himself to destroy all the soul's sins and speaks to him, saying, "After this, why should you grieve ?"

Next, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] reveals the Lord's special intention which makes it so that his grief, once banished, never returns.

262. When I have forgiven your sins and considered them as merits, what right do you have to grieve ?

I have already forgiven the sins you have committed. Not only that, but afterward, out of the affection (*vatsalya*) that I have

for you, I do not think of them as sins, but rather I consider them to be merits, as it is said · "Taking the sins I have comitted to be merits!"[72] and "If [my devotees] did that, they did well."[73]

Thus, these five words in the second half [of the Caramaśloka] have stated the following :

1) the nature of the one who removes ["aham"],

2) the locus of the things to be removed ["tvā"],

3) the sins—that is, the things to be removed ["sarvapāpebhyo"],

4) how they are to be removed ["mokṣayiṣyāmi"],

5) the cessation of grief which results from their removal ["mā śucaḥ"].

After this, he concludes by revealing the following, in turn :

1) how rare it is for one to take delight in this śloka,

2) what the aim of this śloka is,

3) how rare it is for one to have faith in it,

4) the reason why the Lord himself didn't teach it in the beginning,

5) why the Vedas enjoin other upāyas,

6) that there is no fault in relinquishing other upāyas outright,[74]

7) the fact that, since these [upāyas] are included in a different form, they are not really abandoned outright (*svarūpeṇa tyakta*),

8) what the sādhana for attainment is,

9) what has to be present on the part of the soul in order to attain the result,

10) that the Lord does not want the soul's good deeds,

11) that if one believes [and follows] these words, he will be redeemed—if not, he will be destroyed,

12) that if one without determination (*vyavasāya*) engages in this [upāya] it will end in destruction,

13) the ones who are qualified for this.

For the first of these, he cites an anecdote to illustrate how rare it is that one would delight in this [śloka].

263. The words that *Rāmānuja* spoke to *Uyyakkōṇṭār*[75] should be remembered

Uyyakkōṇṭār, who wrote the *Tatvanirṇayam*, practiced bhakti-yoga (*bhaktiniṣthar*). Rāmānuja, thinking to make him a follower of prapatti *(prapattiniṣthar)* revealed to him the meaning of this śloka, whereupon Uyyakōṇṭār said, "The actual meaning is beautiful; however, I have no desire to relinquish that [bhaktiyoga] and resort to this [prapatti]." Rāmānuja said to him, "Since you are well-learned you accept the meaning, but since you lack the grace of the Lord (*bhagavatprasāda*), you have no desire for it." These words that Rāmānuja revealed are to be contemplated.

After this, he reveals what the chief aim of this śloka is :

264. For this [*śloka*], the chief aim (*nokku*) is the Lord's autonomy (*svātantrya*).

For this śloka—which stands apart from all the śāstras—the essential meaning is the autonomy of the Lord, the self-reliant instigator of all (*svādhīnasakalapravartaka*) who causes [the soul] to relinquish all the dharmas prescribed in śāstra, along with any tendencies [to doing them again]; then he himself becomes the self-sufficient sādhana *(nirapekṣasādhana)* for the cetana, destroying all the sins which obstruct [the cetana's] salvation (*prāptipratibandhaka-sakalapāpaṅkaḷ)* and granting attainment of himself *(svaprāpti)*.

After this, he reveals how rare it is for one to have faith in this:

265. ***Vaṅkippurattu Nampi's***[76] **view was that "This [*śloka*] itself is in the category of a statement of what has already occurred (*anuvāda*).**

The most authorative Vaṅkippurattu Nampi revealed that this śloka's meaning itself is in the category of an *anuvāda.*

He explains how this is so :

266. This is because [*Kṛṣṇa*] says to resort to him after [Arjuna] has already recognized that [*Kṛṣṇa*] alone is his refuge because of 1) *Kṛṣṇa's* heroic deeds, 2) the statements of the sages, and 3) the fact that *Kṛṣṇa* took upon himself [Arjuna's] work (*kārya*).

Arjuna, who was qualified (*adhikāri*) for this [upāya], had faith that "All the upāyas he talks about are not our refuge—he alone is our refuge." [He knew this] first of all from the superhuman deeds Kṛṣṇa performed from his youth on, which demonstrate his ability to do the impossible. Secondly, there were the statements made by the sages (*ṛṣi*) who had true knowledge of the higher and lower realities, saying :

> The illustrious Nārāyaṇa, who reclines on the milk ocean, has arisen from his serpent couch and come to the city of Mathurā.[77]
>
> Where the meritorious Dvārakā is, there is Madhusūdana. He indeed is the truly primordial deity. He indeed is the eternal dharma.[78]
>
> Where the deity Nārāyaṇa is, the eternal supreme spirit, there is the entire world, O Partha, and all holy rivers and temples.[79]
>
> Brahmins who know the Veda and people learned in spiritual matters speak of the great Kṛṣṇa as the eternal dharma.[80]
>
> Govinda is called the holiest of the holy, he is the merit of all merits, the most auspicious of all that is auspicious.[81]

> Kṛṣṇa indeed is the origin and destruction of the world. For the sake of Kṛṣṇa this entire universe, animate and inanimate, exists.[82]

Furthermore, from his childhood on—regardless of whether he was living in the city or in the forest—Kṛṣṇa looked after Arjuna's needs as one who had that responsibility. It is after [Arjuna attained this faith] that Kṛṣṇa says "Such being the case, resort to me." For this reason [it has been called an *anuvāda*].

He tells why this [śloka's meaning] was not taught at the beginning :

267. All that has transpired heretofore is in order to test [Arjuna's] heart.

He first began to teach the upāyas when Arjuna said, "Tell me conclusively what is best. I am your disciple who has taken refuge in you, Teach me."[83] But rather than teaching this [upāya] right at the beginning, he exhaustively taught the other upāyas. All this was done in order to test Arjuna's heart, to find out whether he would stop at this or, by seeing the faults of these [other upāyas], become qualified (*adhikāri*) to be instructed in this upāya.

If he taught the other upāyas in this way just to test [Arjuna's] heart, then why does the Veda enjoin them ?

268. The Veda enjoins the other *upāyas* just like people fasten a log to an unruly cow—in order to remove the willfulness (*kaḷippu*) coming from egoism and possessiveness (*ahaṅkāra, mamakāra*) and give rise to knowledge of one's true nature *svarūpajñāna*).

The most perfect Veda has enjoined other upāyas as ways to mokṣa by such statements as the following ;

> Having understood [the supreme spirit] he should meditate on him.[84]

> Meditate on the self as "Om."[85]

Reverence the world as the self.[86]

The *ātman* is to be seen, heard, thought about and meditated upon.[87]

In order to impede and control a cow who wanders astray [into others' fields] while grazing, people will tie a log to its neck. Like that cow, the soul is wandering lustfully under the sway of his egoism and possessiveness. But, "in thousands previous births, through penance, study, and meditation,"[88] when the individual is oppressed by difficult requirements that are physically exhausting—such as performing karmas and torturing the senses—that lustful willfulness will go away. Then knowledge of his true nature—his dependence on the Lord (*bhagavatpāratantrya*)—will arise. For this reason [these upāyas are enjoined].

But if so, then wouldn't it be wrong to relinquish these things which bring about knowledge of the *svarūpa* in this way? To this he reveals :

269. Just as a *sanyāsi* gives up previous things, if one who has attained such [knowledge of the *svarūpa*] gives these up, no fault will occur.

One who has entered the last stage of life (*āśrama*) gives up the duties of the previous stages. It is the same for one who has gained this measure of ripened knowledge such that he employs only the *siddhopāya* [the Lord himself] because these other upāyas are contrary to the soul's true nature. There will be no fault if he gives up these other upāyas.

He reveals that since these [upāyas] are included in another form, he does not entirely give them up.

270. He does not abandon these outright (*nerāka viṭṭilan̲*).

This same *adikāri*, who accepts the accomplished (*siddha*) sādhana after completely abandoning other sādhanas, does not actually (*svarūpena*) abandon these things—karma, jñāna, etc.

As to how that is so, he reveals :

271. Karma is included in service (*kaiṅkarya*), *jñāna* is included in the manifestation of the soul's true nature (*svarūpaprakāśa*), bhakti is included in the desire for the goal; prapatti is included in knowledge of the soul's nature as it really is (*svarūpayātātmya-jñāna*).

The prescribed karmas which he performs according to his own *varṇa* and *āśrama* are performed—not with the idea that they are sādhanas—but only out of compassion, for the sake of others, thereby greatly pleasing the Lord. Thus karma is contained in the service which he does to please the Lord.

The subtle jñāna, which [Nammāḷvār] calls "nuṇṇaṟivu—fine knowledge," [89] is that which illuminates the nature of the Lord, after first making known one's own nature. As the idea of sādhana disappears, this knowledge is included in the manifestation of the soul's true nature.

As it is said, "By devotion (*bhakti*) alone can I be known," [90] bhakti is a sādhana to attainment to the Lord. But as the idea of sādhana goes away, this devotion is included in the desire [to please the Lord] which is something that must be present in the moment prior to service—the goal to be attained (*prāpya*)—just like hunger [must be present before] eating.

Prapatti, which means choosing the *siddhopāya*, is dropped from being a sadhana as stated in the word "ekam." But [such recognition of the Lord as the *siddhopāya*] is included in the true knowledge of the soul's essential nature as having no other refuge on account of [the soul's] extreme dependence [on the Lord] (*atyantapāratantryatayā ananyaśaraṇam*)

If both bhakti and prapatti are excluded [from being sādhanas], what is one's sādhana to the goal ? To this he reveals :

272. Since he has taught a difficult way and an easy way to the same goal, it must be that the *upāya* is not these two but the Lord's grace alone.

For the one goal—attainment of the Lord—he has taught two paths. The path of bhakti (*bhaktimārga*) is difficult because it

must be accomplished by means of its ancillaries (karma, jñāna, etc.) in many births. As it is said :

> Through penance, study, and meditation, etc., in thousands of other births, devotion (*bhakti*) to Kṛṣṇa arises to men whose sins have been destroyed.[91]

The path of prapatti (*prapattimārga*) is easy because it is performed once-and-for-all, after first ceasing from all activity (*sakalapravṛttinivṛtti*), as stated in "sarva dharmān parityajya." Therefore, the difficulty or easiness of the sādhana is not of essential importance. Rather, it is the grace (*prasāda*) of the one who grants the result because of some such pretext (*tattatvyājena*).[92] which matters. Therefore, rather than these two—bhakti or prapatti—the grace of the Lord must be the upāya.

Even if that is so, isn't there anything that needs to be present on the part of the soul for attainment? To this he replies :

273. What is needed for attainment is not to prevent and to request.

What needs to be present on the cetana's part to accomplish the result is 1) not preventing the salvation [the Lord] offers by one's own efforts (*svayatna*) and 2) making the request, which facilitates the ultimate aim (*puruṣārtha*).

On the other hand, wouldn't it be fitting if he also had some good deeds ? To this he replies that these are not desired by the one who is the upāya.

274. The holy son [*Rāma*] of the emperor [*Daśaratha*] said that even if one comes to him with sins, he will be accepted. This one [*Kṛṣṇa*] said that he must get rid of merits and then come.

The holy son of the emperor [Daśaratha] who is called "Rāma, the dharma incarnate," [93] said "even if he be Rāvaṇa himself," [94] meaning, "Bring him in, even if he is the most wicked Rāvaṇa himself." Since sins have no reason to be considered a cause for

attainment, [Piḷḷai Lokācārya] says, "even if one comes to him with sins, he will be accepted."

The one who is called "Kṛṣṇa, the eternal dharma," [95] by his statement "sarva dharmān parityajya," declared that one has to first abandon merits—which might be considered a basis for attainment—and then approach him. Therefore, the idea is that since the one who is the upāya does not tolerate any connection with associates (*sahāyāntarasaṁsarga*), good deeds on the part of the soul are not desired.

For one who is steeped in this truth, there is salvation as a believer; as an unbeliever, destruction. There is no middle state other than these. He makes this known by the words of a previous ācārya :

275. There is the statement *Empār* made to *Bhaṭṭar*, "If one engages [in this] as a believer, having desire and faith, there is salvation: as an unbeliever, destruction. There is no other middle ground."

One who is involved in this truth as a believer, who affirms that this is true because of the Lord's greatness, who has delight in this truth, and who has faith that it will not fail—he is saved. One who engages in this as an unbeliever and disparages it, saying, "Can there really be something like this which stands apart from all the śāstras ?"—he is destroyed. There is no middle ground between these. Such were the words which the most authoritative Empār revealed to Bhaṭṭar, who was extremely learned in all the śāstras.

Using an illustration, he reveals that one who lacks faith will be destroyed by engaging in this.

276. For one who lacks determination (*vyavasāya*), engaging in this is like eating when one has indigestion.

For one who is without sufficient determination to relinquish [other upāyas] and accept [the Lord as the upāya] as stated in this

[śloka], engaging in this will end up causing destruction, just as eating when one has indigestion will cause death.

He reveals who is qualified for this :

277. Those who are qualified [for this *śloka*] are those who have been disciplined as stated [in the verse] "*Viṣṇucitta* has heard...."[96]

"Viṣṇucitta has heard the great words of truth proclaimed by Lord "Raṅganātha who has all good qualities." This [hymn] tells how Pĕriyāḻvār [Viṣṇucitta]—who was perfect in thought, word and deed—was trusting his own ability [to save himself]. But while relaxing in the temple [one day] he heard the words "mām ekam śaraṇam vraja—resort to me alone," which were revealed from the chariot—seat, using Arjuna as a pretext. Having heard these words whose meaning is true, illustrious and easily grasped, he acted on them. According to this statement, those qualified for this truth are those who hear it and who discipline themselves according to it.

He concludes by revealing some holy sayings of the Āḻvārs who followed this truth ; [their words] ought to be contemplated as the meaning of this [śloka] :

278. The hymns [beginning] "Those who know the words" [97] and "Becoming a father" [98] should be contemplated as [this *śloka's*] meaning.

The births which tightly envelop this soul, as if surrounding him with a cocoon ; along with that, the illnesses which ensue once he enters into these births ; along with that, old age which strikes like a lightning bolt, such that he can't remain but a short time even in that state ; and finally, the death he dreads, keeping him from staying alive even in that state—all these things the Lord removes, like skilled laborers pushing down a tall wall. Finally, he banishes—along with its tendencies—the great misery of *kaivalya* [99] and joins [the devout souls] to his holy feet, as if they were decorative lines painted on them, and protects these souls so that they never again return [to saṁsāra]. Those who know the good words, "mām ekam śaraṇam vraja" and "sarva pāpebhyo

mokṣayiṣyāmi" ("Resort to me alone" and "I will release you from all sins"), who think about this protection he has given them and have faith in it—will they become the servants of anyone other than the wondrous one in whom they take refuge, the one who destroys all obstacles ? This is the meaning of Nammāḷvār's hymn beginning "Those who know the words . . . "

The one who is untouched by even the smell of saṁsāra, being the opposite of all that is objectionable, grants the land of freedom to souls who reside in all bodies. He banishes the manifold births which are alike by virtue of having sentient knowledge as their basic form, but which are dissimilar because of the distinctions between gods, [men, animals,] etc. In order to take us, who have been eternally caught in saṁsāra, into the service which the eternally free souls perform, he becomes a father who only acts for our welfare, a mother who only gives up pleasure, and our master who can take us into service. Becoming all kinds of relationships in this way, disregarding our lowliness and his own greatness, he has taken upon himself all our responsibilities. In so doing, he has entered into us—who are despicable—and mingled closely with us. O, my ignorant heart ! Are we omniscient, so as to know our own welfare ? Is he ignorant? Are we capable of bringing about our own welfare ? Is he powerless ? Do we have a right to do the work [of saving ourselves] ? Is he unworthy (*aprāpta*) ? Now that the one who stooped to favor us, regardless of his own superiority, is present, why are you lying in an ocean of misery ? This is the meaning of the hymn of Tirumaḷicaippirāṉ beginning, "Becoming a father . . . "

Both of these are to be meditated on as [relating] the meaning of this sloka.

Thus, the following things have been stated by this śloka:

1) the particular dharmas which are to be relinquished a an ancillary *(aṅga)* of acceptance ["sarvadharmān"],

2) the manner in which those dharmas are relinquished ["parityajya"]

3) the qualities of accessibility, etc. possessed by the one who is resorted to after relinquishing those dharmas ["mām"],

4) the fact that the one so qualified has no need for anything else ["ekam"],

5) the fact that this one who has no need for anything else is the upāya ["śaraṇam"],

6) acceptance (*svīkāra*) of this one as the upāya ["vraja"].

7) the fact that this accepted upāya is endowed with the qualities of knowledge, power, etc. ["aham"],

8) the *adhikāri* who has surrendered the responsibility [of his salvation] (*nyastabhara*) ["tvā"],

9) the aggregate of sins which are obstacles for the *adhikāri* ["sarvapāpebhyo"],

10) how those sins are released ["mokṣayiṣyāmi"],

11) the freedom from responsibility on the part of the *adhikāri* who has resorted to the one who releases him from those sins ["mā śucaḥ"].

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This anecdote may be compared with the *Guruparamparā Prabhāvam 6,000* (ed. and publ. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Trichy, 1975) pp. 193–94, which tells how Rāmānuja approached Tirukkoṭṭiyūr Nampi eighteen times, but says that it was the meaning of the Tirumantra that he learned from him and then proclaimed from the temple tower in Tirukkoṭṭiyūr. After Nampi saw Rāmānuja's compassion for others, he decided to teach him the meaning of the Carama-śloka as well.

2. Sanskrit quote, source unknown.

3. Maṇavāḷamāmuni is clearly attacking Vedānta Deśika's view that the gerund form of the verb *parityajya*, "relinquishing," means that "relinquishing all dharmas" is not part of the injunction *(vidhi)* but an *anuvāda*, or statement of a situation that has already occurred. Deśika (in *RTS*. ch. 29) argues that the other sādhanas, such as bhaktiyoga, are valid upāyas and that Kṛṣṇa is not ordering Arjuna to give them up. Rather, recognizing that Arjuna is too impatient for mokṣa to undertake the lengthy and difficult course of bhaktiyoga, Kṛṣṇa enjoins prapatti as an easier and quicker upāya, suitable for those who lack any of the necessary qualifications–including patience and stamina—for bhaktiyoga. See *cūrṇa* 202 and note.

4. *BhG* 3 20.

5. *BhG* 3.19.

6. *BhG* 4.33.

7. *BhG* 4.38.

8. *BhG* 4.37.

9. *BhG* 11 .54.

10. *BhG* 9.34.

11. *BhG* 4.9.

12. *BhG* 15.20.

13. Attributed to the *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, Śrīraṅga Māhātmya.

14. *Mbh* 13.135.30.

15. Attributed to *Narasiṁha Purāṇa* 33.27, but not found in Bombay edition.

16. The five great sacrifices required of all twice–born males are: to the ancestors *(pitṛ)*, deities *(deva)*, sages *(ṛṣi)*, guests *(manuṣya, atithi)*, and creatures *(bhūta)*.

17. *Dakṣasmṛti* 2.27, *SS.*

18. "Codanālakṣaṇārtho dharmaḥ," *Jaimini Mīmāṁsā Sūtras* 1.1.2.

19. *Manusmṛti* 11.54.

20. Attributed to *Viṣṇudharma* 66.71. Vedānta Deśika objects to interpreting the context of this passage to imply that it is the upāyas for mokṣa such as karma, bhakti, and jñānayoga which the Lord is here calling sins. He says, "There is no authority stating that when [the Lord] says 'Since you are mortally afraid of sins' he is deprecating *upāsana* [bhaktiyoga] and the like by referring to them as sins. Therefore, because they are both enjoined for one who seeks mokṣa, bhakti and prapatti are each to be undertaken according to one's qualification" (*RTS* ch. 24 : p. 709).

21. Attributed to *Uśanaḥ Saṁhitā* 5.50.

22. The interpretation of the meaning of the participial form of *parityajya* is hotly disputed by the Tĕṉkalai and Vaṭakalai ācāryas. The question is whether "having relinquished" is to be taken as a *vidhi,* an injunction, or as an *anuvāda,* a statement of a condition that has already come about. The question is legitimate, since Sanskrit grammar supports both interpretations, as illustrated in the passages cited here. If a Dharmaśāstra text says "Having bathed, one should take food," then bathing is being ordered along with eating—one is first to bathe and then to take food. Thus in this case the participial form stands for an injunction *(vidhi)*. In the statement "Having eaten [something forbidden] do the month-long fast," eating forbidden things is not being enjoined along with its expiation. Rather, it means *if* one has eaten something forbidden, *then* one should do the fast. Thus the participial form in the first clause must be taken as a statement of what has already occurred (*anuvāda*). In the context of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, these alternatives for interpreting the Caramaśloka's "parityajya" have important doctrinal

implications. Is Kṛṣṇa ordering Arjuna to give up all other upāyas? This is what Maṇavāḷamāmuni and the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas conclude by taking "parityajya" as a *vidhi*. They argue that bhaktiyoga and the like are not really upāyas at all but impediments to mokṣa which—because they demand that one make efforts to save himself—are contrary to the soul's dependence on the Lord. Complete surrender to the Lord himself as one's savior, recognizing that he is the only true means to mokṣa, is in keeping with the soul's dependent nature ; this is what is enjoined in the last line of the Caramaśloka. The Vaṭakalai school prefers to interpret *parityajya* as an *anuvāda*. Vedānta Deśika argues that outright renunciation of bhaktiyoga and its accessories is not being ordered here ; bhaktiyoga is fully in keeping with the soul's capacity to act on its own and is a valid upāya which the Lord has enjoined in many scriptures for those who are qualified for it. Rather, Kṛṣṇa here is recognizing that Arjuna, on account of his impatience to attain the Lord, is not qualified for the time-consuming path of bhaktiyoga and has already given it up. This qualifies him for the alternative upāya, prapatti or surrender to the Lord, which Kṛṣṇa enjoins in the next line of the Caramaśloka as a quick and easy way to attain the supreme goal. (See *RTS* 29 : pp. 1036 ff.)

23. *Rā* 6.47.129.

24. *Rā*, variant reading following 6.47.132.

25. "Rāma is the dharma incarnate (*vigrahavān dharmaḥ*), good, having the courage of truth, the king of all the world, like Indra of the gods." *Rā* 3.37.13.

26. "Kṛṣṇam dharmam sanātanam," *Mbh* 3.86.22.

27. Since it has been stated above that all the *aṅgas* of bhaktiyoga and karmayoga (such as the *nityanaimittika karmas*) have been included in the command to relinquish all dharmas, it does not seem consistent here to argue that refraining from *adharmas* is not implied because avoidance of wrong-doing is

only an *aṅga* of dharma. However, this position can be supported with the Tĕṉkalai view that refraining from action is not itself an action, and therefore cannot be seen as a *dharma*, *sādhana*, or *upāya*—all words which imply positive self-effort and activity. Using this same argument, they deny that prapatti—which consists only of relinquishing action and recognizing the Lord to be the upāya—is a sadhana or upāya. Vedānta Deśika, however, argues that even refraining from action *(nivṛtti)* is still an action *(pravṛtti)* involving knowledge, will, and effort *(RTS* ch. 29 : p. 1045, ch. 5 : p. 140). Thus he rejects the Tĕṉkalai ācaryas' contention that prapatti is not an act and therefore not an upāya or sādhana.

28. *BhG* 1.22.

29. *Lakṣmī Tantra*, 17.10. The meaning of this passage is somewhat at variance with the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas' doctrine that the Lord has *niraṅkuśasvātantrya*, unconstrained autonomy, such that he can sometimes choose to accept the soul out of his own autonomous desire, without waiting for a request. Further on in this text, (*cūrṇā*s 226–7) Piḷḷai Lokācārya says that we should consider this request as worthless, because the Lord doesn't need it. This point is brought out much more clearly and forcefully in the *Śrīvacana Bhūṣaṇa,* where a distinction is made between *paragatasvīkāra,* acceptance where the Lord takes the initiative, and *svagatasvīkāra,* acceptance where the soul takes the initiative and requests protection. Maṇavāḷamāmuni says that while the former will never fail, even when the soul's desire and request is lacking, the latter may not always succeed *(ŚVB* 142). Examples of successful *paragatasvikāra* are Guha and Hanumān, whom Rāma accepted on his own initiative, without any desire or request on their part. *Svagatasvīkāra* does not always succeed, as illustrated by Bhārata, whose prapatti to Rāma requesting him to return to rule Ayodhya was denied (*ŚVB* 144–5, 150). Nammāḻvār's own salvation is also interpreted to be a case of *paragatasvīkāra*, completely unprecedented by his own initiative, and the Lord's right to do that is unequivocally affirmed *(Ā cHṛ*

94–113). See Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Śrīvacana Bhūṣaṇa* with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary, ed. P. Rāghava Rāmānuja Svāmi (Madras: R. Rajagopal Naidu, 1936) and Aḷakiya-maṇavāḷa Pĕrumaḷ Nāyanār's *Ācārya Hṛdayam* with Maṇavāḷa-māmuni's commentary, in *Śrīmad Varavaramunīndra Granthamala* vol. 1, ed. and publ. P. B. Anangaracharya (Kanchi, 1966).

Vedānta Deśika, on the other hand, more closely follows Vedānta and Pāñcarātra by affirming that the Lord deliberately refrains from acting to save the soul until he gets some small initiative on the part of the soul to use as a pretext *(vyāja)*. He directly attacks the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas' exaggeration of the Lord's autonomy because it threatens the Lord's egalitarian mercy with charges of showing partiality to some and cruelty to others *(vaiṣamyanairghṛṇyaprasaṅga)*. In order to protect his own egalitarian mercy, to respect and preserve the measure of autonomy he has given each individual soul, and to support the śāstras and the karmic order as its impartial judge, Deśika affirms that the Lord does not save without some scripturally enjoined token of the soul's willingness to accept him *(RTS* ch. 23 : pp. 634—40, ch. 24: pp. 705—6).

30. *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 4.9.2, *NDP.*

31. Śrīvaiṣṇava doctrine recognizes five forms in which the Lord manifests himself—his supreme form (*para*), the four *vyūhas* from Pāñcarātra evolutionary cosmology, the *antaryāmi* or inner controller of all sentient souls (from Vedānta), the *vibhavas* or *avatāras*, and the *arcāvatāra*, the Lord as he dwells in the temple image. The Tĕṉkalai ācāryas criticize the former three as being too remote and inaccessible to have any salvific importance. In *ŚVB* 39 Piḷḷai Lokācārya's five waters analogy compares a man thirsting for water and the soul thirsting for salvation: "The *antaryāmi* is like water under the ground, the *para* form is like water surrounding the world-egg, the *vyūhas* are like the milk ocean, the *vibhavas* are like seasonal rivers, but the *arcāvatāra*

is like standing pools in these rivers." Maṇavāḷamāmuni explains that the former three forms of water are of no use to a thirsty man because they are too remote. The seasonal river flows with water only at certain times, but a deep pool in such a river is avilable all the time. In the same way, the former three forms of the Lord are inaccessible to one who desires salvation. The Lord's *avatāras* are available only rarely, but the *arcāvatāra* is constantly accessible and receptive for those who seek protection.

32. *BhG* 4.8.

33. *Mbh* 3.86.22.

34. *Muṇḍaka Upanisad* 1.1.9, *US.*

35. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.8, *US.*

36. "Phalamata upapatteḥ," *BS* 3.2.37. This refers to the Viśiṣṭādvaita doctrine (explained by Rāmānuja in commenting on this *sūtra*) that it is the Lord himself who supervises the cosmic process, granting the results of all karma.

37. *BhG* 1.41.

38. *TVM* 3.6.10.

39. "Māmeva ye prapadyante" *BhG* 7.14.

40. *BhG* 15.4, according to Rāmānuja, reads "Tameva cādyam purusam prapadyet [a]—One should resort to that Primal Person alone." Maṇavāḷamāmuni, like Śaṅkara, takes the verb to be the first person, *prapadye.* Thus the line would expres Kṛṣṇa's recommendation that one should say, "I take refuge with that primal person from whom the ancient process [of saṁsāra] emanated."

41. "Tvamevopāyabhūto me bhava," *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā* 37.31.

42. Āṟēṉakku niṉpātame caraṇākat tantōlintāy," *TVM* 5.7.10.

43. The image of the Lord as the *bhaktiyuḻavaṉ*, the cultivator of devotion, who tills the soil, sows the seeds, irrigates, weeds, and finally reaps the harvest of devotion in souls who surrender to him is developed in several places in Tĕṉkalai literature. A passage in *ŚVB* 387–389 uses this theme to develop the doctrine of the Lord's uncaused grace (*nirhetukakaṭākṣa*) and show how the Lord uses accidental good deeds of his own fashioning as a final pretext to save the soul. In *ĀcHṛ* 94, 104, Maṇavāḷamāmuni elaborates this theme to support the view that Nammāḻvār's devotion was "the fruit of the labors of the Lord of all, the cultivator of bhakti, who toils for the salvation of souls, wandering around making efforts to cultivate devotion for himself in them" (*ĀcHṛ* 104). Thus Nammāḻvār's bhakti was not of his own doing, but a fruit of the Lord's labors, undertaken out of his own causeless grace (*ĀcHṛ* 113); it most certainly was an upāya the Āḻvār practiced to attain mokṣa.

44. A line from *TVM* 2.7.6. "In every *yuga* you are coming toward and surrounding me, whatever birth I take, to show your grace to me. This is the destiny you have determined." The *Īṭu* on this stanza compares the Lord's incarnations to hunters surrounding their prey.

45. *TVM* 8.8.3, "Atuvum avaṉatiṉṉaruḷe." The entire stanza reads : "In order to reach, by his grace, the Lord of those supreme in wisdom, I placed him in my mind. When he entered into me, I realized—that too is but his sweet grace ! And wisdom, life, body, and everything is a waste. He has become my very self."

46. The *sarvamuktiprasaṅga* is one of Vedānta Deśika's most forceful arguments against the position of the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas : if God is truly merciful and demands nothing on the soul's part for salvation to take place, then everyone should have already been saved (*RTS* ch. 24 : pp. 705–6). Here, Maṇavāḷamāmuni does not elaborate, but the implication is that by saving only those who express acceptance of him, the Lord gets around the *sarvamuktiprasaṅga*. This

seems somewhat at odds with their view that such acceptance is to be considered as worthless and unnecessary for salvation. Compare *ŚVB* 381–83, where the Lord is said to use accidental good deeds of his own fashioning as a pretext to save the soul in order to avoid the *sarvamuktiprasaṅga*.

47. Maṇavāḷamāmuni here notices that Piḷḷai Lokācārya uses the personal plural pronoun for "others" here when he is referring to the inanimate upāyas. He finds a precedent for such usage in Nammāḻvār's *TVM* 5.8.3 : "What can I do? Who will remove my difficulties? What are you doing to me? I will not seek anything from anyone but you. O Lord of Kumbakonam, surrounded by beautiful waterfalls! When will my time of great difficulty be over? Please see that I am holding your feet on that day."

48. Compare *ŚVB* 146–7, where prapatti undertaken as *svagata-svīkāra*, acceptance of the Lord when the cetana takes the initiative, is declared to be a shameful offense. It is said to be like a wife who, after living with another man for a long time, goes to her husband and asks him to accept her.

49. *TVM* 9.1.7 "In brief I will tell you—there is nothing else for the souls in this wide world. Don't trouble yourself (*ciṟṟaveṇṭā*)! It is enough to think [of the Lord]."

50. *TVM* 2.7.8.

51. *TVM* 2.7.7.

52. *Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā* 37.29.

53. Based partly on Maṇavāḷamāmuni's summary of this *cūrṇā*, I have taken the import of this difficult passage as follows: in order to make sure that no one makes the mistake of concluding that the relinquishing of other upāyas is only necessary at the moment of ultimate attainment, the word "śaraṇam," meaning "upāya" or means, shows clearly that such relinquishing accompanies the means for that attainment,

not just the attainment itself. The *Arumpatavilakkam* of Toṭṭayyaṅkār and Śuddhasatva Empāvaiyyaṅkār, a sub-commentary on the *Mumukṣuppaṭi* (Madras: Tiruveṅkaṭācāryar Memorial Press, 1890) takes it differently : that even though relinquishing of other upāyas is found both in accepting the means and in attaining the goal, the word "śaraṇam" is necessary here in order to exclude *upāyatva* from acceptance of the means itself. However, by Maṇavāḷamāmuni's own statement in *cūrṇa* 229, that has already been excluded by the "ekam."

54. *Śrībhāṣya* at the beginning of his commentary on *BS* 1.1.1 : "Ākṣepataḥ prāptādābhidhānikasyaiva grāhyatvāt."

55. Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Parantapaṭi*, *ADR* p. 137.

56. *TVM* 6.5.11.

57. The Tēṉkalai ācāryas are reluctant to admit that prapatti consists of anything other than bare mental affirmation of the Lord as the upāya (after relinquishing other upāyas). Nevertheless, they let in the same kinds of things that the Vaṭakalai school considers *aṅgas* to prapatti under the guise of qualifications. They cannot admit that such things as prostration and *añjali* are part of prapatti, or else they would have to admit that prapatti itself is a positive activity involving knowledge, will, and effort ; to do so would put them one step closer to asserting that prapatti is an upāya. Nevertheless the Tēṉkalais practice these things. Thus they informally consider them part of the qualification for prapatti rather than prapatti itself. Both schools consider *ākiñcanya* and *ananyagatitva* to be the "official" qualifications for prapātti.

58. *Mbh* 12.306.84, "jñānānmokṣo jāyate."

59. *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 1.1.9, *US*.

60. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.8, *US*.

61. Paraphrase of the first line of Rāmānuja's *Śriraṅgagadya* (*SM* p. 12). Commentators take the three kinds of sentient beings to be those that are bound, freed, and eternally free *(baddha, mukta, nitya)*.

62. *Tiruviruttam* 1, *NDP.*

63. *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 3.1.3, *US.*

64. Here dharmas done out of compassion or *lokasaṅgraha*, desire for the welfare and support of the world, seem to be inescapably upāyas and are thus to be included in the sins from which the Lord releases one. Compare *ŚVB* 278, where Maṇavāḷamāmuni quotes Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Taṉiśloka [sic]* saying that performing the bare minimum of dharmas out of compassion, to set an example for the upliftment of sons and disciples, are a form of service pleasing to the Lord and should be performed. (The reference is actually to *Taṉicaramam*, p. 333 *ADR*, not *Taṉiśloka.)* The idea seems to be that if one's primary aim is to please the Lord, *lokasaṅgraha* dharmas can be included in service. If one's primary aim is only compassion for others, then such actions are upāyas and—for the prapanna—sins which the Lord must forgive.

65. "Unmādaścittavibhramaḥ," *Amarakośa* 1.200.

66. *Taṉicaramam*, p, 147 *ADR.*

67. Attributed to *Viṣṇudharma* 66.71. See *cūrṇa* 201 and note, above. Perhaps because of the context, and because Piḷḷai Lokācārya has already established that egoistic self-initiated refuge-seeking is a sin (*cūrṇa* 230), Maṇavāḷamāmuni limits the reference of this *cūrṇa* to *punaḥprapatti*, prapatti performed subsequent to one's original *śaraṇāgati.* Here Maṇavāḷamāmuni underlines his difference with Vedānta Deśika and the Vaṭakalai school, who perform prapatti again as a *prāyaścitta* for any subsequent deliberate sin.

68. *Pĕriya Tiruvantāti* 54, *NDP.*

69. *Taṉicaramam*, p. 147 *ADR.*

70. *BhG* 8.34.

71. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 115, *NDP*. See *cūrṇa* 278.

72. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 111, *NDP*. "People say that you can be reached even by those who have abused you with harsh words, by those who fought against you in the battlefield and were destroyed by your anger. Therefore, O Māyaṉ, take the sins comitted by a dog like me to be merits, O Lord of the universe."

73. *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 4.9.2, *NDP*. "Even if the lady of the lotus points out the sins of his servants, the Lord would say 'My devotees would never do that. If they did, they did well."

74. The sentence "upāyāntaraṅkaḷai svarūpeṇa tyajikkumaḷavil doṣamillai"—"There is no harm in relinquishing other upāyas outright," recalls Vedānta Deśika's chief criticism of the interpretation of the Caramaśloka made by both the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas and the Advaitins. That is, by interpreting *parityajya* as a commandment *(vidhi)*, they end up advocating *svarūpa-tyāga*, outright renunciation of enjoined dharmas. Deśika tries to tar the Tĕṉkalai interpretation with the Advaitin's brush in ch. 29 of *RTS*, (pp. 1044 ff.) The next point Maṇavāḷamāmuni makes, that performance of these dharmas is maintained by the prapanna in another form, as service, seems to try to answer that criticism. See *cūrṇas* 270–71.

75. Not the Uyyakkoṇṭār who preceded Yāmuna, but one of Rāmānuja's disciples, also known as Puṇḍarīkākṣa.

76. Also known as Āndhra Pūrṇa, a disciple of Rāmānuja.

77. Variant reading of *Mbh* 3.86.20.

78. *Mbh* 3.86.21.

79. *Mbh* 3.86.25.

80. *Mbh* 3.86.22.

81. *Mbh* 3.86.23.

82. *Mbh* 2.35.22 and 12.336.82.

83. *BhG* 2.7.

84. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.21, *US.*

85. *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 2.2.6, *US.*

86. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.15, *US.*

87. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 6.5.6, *US.*

88. Attributed to *Laghvatrismṛti* 1.

89. *TVM* 5.7.1.

90. *BhG* 11.54.

91. Attributed to *Laghvatrismṛti* 1.

92. Vedānta Deśika often states that prapatti and bhaktiyoga—the *sādhyopāyas* to be performed by the soul—are *vyājas*, pretexts on which the Lord—the *siddhopāya*—bestows his saving grace Here, Maṇavāḷamāmuni uses the word *vyāja* to refer to bhaktiyoga and prapatti. This usage is rare among the Tēṉkalai ācāryas, but it does not really show any concession to Vedānta Deśika's views. For Deśika, performance of the appropriate *vyāja* is absolutely necessary for the Lord to save, for that is what propitiates *(vaśikari-)* the *siddhopāya* and calls out his saving grace. Thus Deśika does not mind calling them *upāyas* and auxiliary causes *(sahakaraṇa)* of salvation *(RTS* ch. 29 : pp. 1077–90, 1091). For Maṇavāḷamāmuni and the Tēṉkalai ācāryas, however, it is the Lord who may take it upon himself to use "some such pretext"—bhakti, prapatti, or even accidental or imagined good deeds *(yadṛcchikasukṛta)*—as an excuse to save the soul. The initiative is entirely the Lord's, and once he has made up his mind to save the soul, the presence or absence of any merits or actions on the part of the soul is irrelevant. (See *ŚVB* 381–83, 387–89, 396, *ĀcHṛ* 107–113.)

93. *Rā* 3.37.13.

94. *Rā* 6.12.19. The context is Vibhīṣaṇa's *śaraṇāgati*: "Bring him in, O best of monkeys, this one to whom I have granted protection—whether he be Vibhīṣaṇa, or even Rāvaṇa himself, Sugrīva !

95. *Mbh* 3.86.22.

96. Āṇṭāḷ's *Nāacciyār Tirumōḻi* 11.10, *NDP*: "Viṣṇucitta has heard the great words of truth uttered by Lord Raṅganātha who has all good qualities. Those who delight in the Lord are beloved by Him. If this statement becomes a lie, who will follow it?" Pĕriyavāccān Piḷḷai interprets this as a reference to the Caramaśloka, where the Lord takes responsibility for doing the work of saving the soul. See *Nāacciyār Tirumōḻi* with Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's commentary, ed. Akkārakkaṉi Rāghavācārya (Madras: Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Mudrāpaka Sabhā, 1923).

97. *TVM* 7.5.10: "Those who know these words—will they be servants to anyone but Viṣṇu? [Not] if they think clearly of the favors he has done for us by destroying illness and old age, along with ensnaring birth, cutting and removing the root of great suffering, and placing us at his feet."

98. *Tiruccantaviruttam* 115: "Becoming a father, mother, and ruling master, he destroys our various births (lit., our similar and different births) and takes us into his service. This ever-free Mukunda enters into us and fills us. O, poor heart, why are you immersed in an ocean of misery?." See *cūrṇā* 261.

99. See *cūrṇā* 1 and note.

APPENDIX I

THE AṢṬĀŚLOKĪ OF PARĀŚARA BHAṬṬAR (B. 1122)[1]

[Tirumantra section : "om namo nārāyaṇāya"]

अकारार्थो विष्णुर्जगदुदयरक्षाप्रलयकृत्
मकारार्थो जीवस्तदुपकरण वैष्णवमिदम् ।
उकारोऽनन्यार्ह नियमयति संबन्धमनयो :
त्रयीसारस्त्रयात्मा प्रणव इममर्थ समदिशत् ।। २ ।।

1. The meaning of the letter *a* is *Viṣṇu* who causes the creation, protection, and destruction of the world. The meaning of the letter *m* is the soul who is the instrument of *Viṣṇu*. The letter *u*, indicates the relationship of belonging to no one else. The three syllabled *Praṇava*, the essence of the three Vedas, points out this meaning.

मन्त्रब्रह्मणि मध्यमेन नमसा पुंसः स्वरूपं गति :
गम्य शिक्षितमीक्षितेन पुरत : पश्चादपि स्थानत: ।
स्वातन्त्र्यं निजरक्षण समुचिता वृत्तिश्च नान्योचिता
तस्यैवेति हरेर्विविच्य कथित स्वस्यापि नार्ह तत: ।। २ ।।

2. The "namas," the middle word in this superior mantra, teaches the [soul's] true nature, way, and goal. By looking at what goes before and after, autonomy, self-protection, and the suitable occupation [of serving] are clearly said to be appropriate to none but Hari. Therefore one is not for oneself.

अकारार्थायैव स्वमहमथ मह्यं न निवहा :
नाराणां नित्यानामयनमिति नारायणपदम् ।
यमाहास्मै कालं सकलमपि सर्वत्र सकलासु
अवस्थास्वाविः स्युः मम सहजकैङ्कर्यविधय : ॥ ३ ॥

3. I am the property of the one indicated in the letter *a*, I am not my own. The word "*nārāyaṇa*" means the abode of the group of eternal "*nāras*."[2] The dative case–ending says that my performances of spontaneous service for him should take place at all times, in all places, and under all conditions.

देहासक्तात्मबुद्धिर्यदि भवति पदं साधु विद्यात्तृतीयम्
स्वातन्त्र्यान्धो यदि स्यात् प्रथममितरशेषत्वधीश्चेद्द्वितीयम् ।
आत्मत्राणोन्मुखश्चेन्नम इति च पदं बान्धवाभासलोल:
शब्दं नारायणाख्यं विषयचपलधीश्चेच्चतुर्थी प्रपन्न : ॥ ४ ॥

4. If he thinks that the soul is the body, the wise prapanna should learn the third syllable [in the *aum*, *m*]. If he is blind with autonomy, the first [*a*]. If subservient to another, the second [*u*]. If trying to protect himself, the word "*namaḥ*." If hankering after those who only appear to be kinsmen, the word "*nārāyaṇa*." If his mind is involved in wordly matters, the dative case–ending [on the word "*nārāyaṇa*"].

[Dvayam section: "śrīman nārāyaṇa caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye, śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ"]

नेतृत्वं नित्ययोगं समुचितगुणजातं तनुख्यापनं च
उपाय कर्तव्यभागं त्वथ मिथुनपरं प्राप्यमेवं प्रसिद्धम् ।
स्वामित्वं प्रार्थनां च प्रबलतरविरोधिप्रहाणं दशैतान्
मन्तारं त्रायते चेत्यधिगतनिगमष्षट्पदोऽयं द्विखण्ड : ॥ ५ ॥

27

5. **This mantra with six words and two parts is the essence of the Veda, protecting the one who meditates on it. It is known to have ten [meanings] : 1) leadership,** [8] **2) eternal union, 3) the class of appropriate qualities, 4) reference to [the Lord's] body, 5) the** ***upāya*****, 6) the part to be done [by the soul], 7) that the supreme couple is the goal, 8) [the Lord's] ownership, 9) the prayer [for protection], 10) the destruction of the greatest obstacles.**

ईशानां जगतामधीशदयितां नित्यानपायां श्रियं
संश्रित्याश्रयणोचिताखिलगुणस्यांघ्री हरेराश्रये ।
इष्टोपायतया श्रिया च सहितायात्मेश्वरायार्थये
कर्तु दास्यमशेषमप्रतिहतं नित्यं त्वह् निर्मम: ।। ६ ।।

6. **Having approached** ***Śrī*****, the eternally inseparable consort of the Lord of the universe, I resort to the feet of Hari, endowed with a host of qualities suitable for taking refuge, as my chosen** ***upāya*****. Wanting nothing for myself, I request to do complete service forever to my Lord who is joined with** ***Śrī*****.**

[Caramaśloka section : "sarvadharmān paritjaya mām ekam śaraṇam vraja, aham tvā sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ"]

मत्प्राप्त्यर्थनया मयोक्तमखिलं सत्यज्य धर्मं पुन :
मामेकं मदवाप्तये शरणमित्यार्तोऽवसायं कुरु ।
त्वामेवं व्यवसाययुक्तमखिलज्ञानादिपूर्णो ह्यहं
मत्प्राप्तिप्रतिबन्धकैर्विरहितं कुर्यां शुच मा कृथा : ।। ७ ।।

7. **Having previously relinquished all the dharmas which I taught for obtaining me, then you who are pained be resolved that for reaching me, the refuge is me alone. For, I who am endowed with all knowledge, etc. will cause you—who are so resolved—to be free of all obstacles to attaining me. Do not grieve.**

निश्चित्य त्वदधीनतां मयि सदा कर्माद्युपायान् हरे
कर्तुं त्यक्तुमपि प्रपत्तुमनलं सीदामि दुःखाकुलः ।
एतज्ज्ञानमुपेयुषो मम पुनस्सर्वापराधक्षयं
कर्तासीति दृढोऽस्मि ते तु चरमं वाक्यं स्मरन् सारथे: ॥ ८ ॥

8. Convinced of my eternal dependence on you, O Hari, I am incompetent to do or even relinquish the *upāyas* such as karma [yoga], or to surrender (to you). Thus I am afflicted with misery. Knowing this, please destroy all my prior sins. I am firmly remembering your last words, O Charioteer !

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Bhaṭṭar's birth date is usually given as 1122 or 1123. His death date is variously given as 1151 and 1174. The present text and interpretation are based on the *Aṣṭāśloki* edited, published, and with commentary by P. B. Annangaracharya, (Kanchi : 1969). The text alone also appears in *SM*.

2. Commentators supply a plural genitive case-ending for "nivaha," rather than the plural nominative as given ; otherwise, this word's meaning in this context would not be clear.

3. Commentators take this as a reference to Śrī's role as a mediator or *puruṣakāra*, since she leads the soul to the Lord.

APPENDIX II

THE NIGAMANAPPAṬI OF PERIYAVĀCCĀṈ PIḶḶAI (1167–1262)

Tirumantra Section :

The Tirumantra has eight holy syllables (*akṣara*) and three words. That is, "om," "namaḥ," and "nārāyaṇāya," are three words. Among these, the first word of one syllable is the Praṇava. It [actually] contains three words—the *a*, *u*, and *m*. The second word is "namas." Its two syllables, "na" and "maḥ," are two words. The word "nārāyaṇāya," the third word, has five syllables. "Nāra" and "ayana" are its two words, plus the "—āya," the fourth case-ending.

The following are the meanings of the letter *a* : Our Lord's status as the protector of all *(sarvarakṣakatva)*, the *śeṣī* of all *(sarvaśeṣitva)*, and the husband of Śrī *(śriyaḥpatitva)*. These are the meanings of the letter *u*: cessation of subservience to others *(anyaśeṣatvanivṛtti)* and subservience to none other than the Lord *(bhagavadananyārhaśeṣatva*). These are the meanings of the letter *m*: the soul's [essential nature of] knowledge and bliss *(jñānānandatva*), that souls are eternal and atomic in size, that they have one form, illuminate themselves to themselves, and are beyond *prakṛti.*

These are the meanings of the word "namas" : cessation of one's egoism and possessiveness *(svāhaṅkāramamakāranivṛtti)* ; the extreme dependence (*atyantapāratantrya)* of the essential nature (*svarūpa*) from which [such egoism and possessiveness] have been

rejected (*nivṛttam*) ; subservience to those who belong to the Lord (*tadīyaśeṣatva*) which is the extreme limit of this dependence (*pāratantryaparākaṣṭhā*) ; that [the Lord?] is the means which is appropriate for the one who is so dependent. [1]

These are the meanings of the word "nāra" : the eternal nature of sentient souls and insentient matter, that they are two groups [sentient and insentient], and that [the members] in these groups are innumerable.

These are the meanings of the word "ayana" : the Lord's status as the supporter (*dhārakatva*) and pervader (*vyāpakatva*) [of the world], his eternality, the fact that he exists in all kinds of relationships [with souls] (*sarvavidhabandhutva*), that he is the goal (*prāpyatva*) and the means (*prāpakatva*), and that he is the cause of the entire world (*sakalajagatkāraṇatva*).

The prayer for eternal service (*nityakaiṅkaryaprārthanā*) is the meaning of the word "–āya."

If one has the notion that there are protectors other than Our Lord, then one must not have taken to heart the meaning of the letter *a*. If one is being subservient to others, then one must not have taken to heart the meaning of the letter *u*. If one goes around thinking that body—which is not the soul—to be the soul, one must not have taken to heart the meaning of the letter *m*. If one goes around being self-autonomous (*svasvātantrya*), thinking one can protect oneself (*svarakṣaṇapratipatti)*, thinking that other Śrīvaiṣṇavas are his equals, or engaging in other upāyas, it must be that one has not taken to heart the meaning of the word "namas." If one has [attachments of] desire or hatred toward sentient or insentient beings which are the Lord's creatures, it must be that one has not taken to heart the meaning of the word "nāra." If one thinks oneself to be related to those with whom one is not [permanently] related, one must not have taken to heart the meaning of the word "ayana." If one has the notion that sensory objects such as sound, etc.—which are not [ultimately] enjoyable—are to be enjoyed, then one has not taken to heart the meaning of the word "–āya."

What is the essential meaning *(tātparya)* of the Tirumantra ? What is its meaning as a whole *(vākyārtha) ?* What is its primary meaning *(pradhānārtha) ?* What is its meditative meaning *(anusandhānārtha) ?* If this be asked : The essential meaning is [conduct] which is approved by all the vedas and śāstras *(sakalavedaśāstraruciparigrahītatva)*. Its meaning as a whole is its description of the essential nature of the goal *(prāpyasvarūpanirupaṇa)*. Its primary meaning is the description of the soul's essential nature *(ātmasvarūpanirūpaṇa)*. Its meditative meaning is contemplation of [the soul's] relationship [with the Lord] *(sambandhānusandhāna)*.

What is that relationship *(sambandha) ?* The letter *a* states the relationship of father and son. The root *av–*, meaning protection, states the relationship of protector and protected. The dropped fourth case–ending [on the letter *a*] states the relationship of *śeṣī* and *śeṣa.* The letter *m* states the relationship between the one to be known [the Lord] and the knower [the soul]. The word "namas" states the relationship between the owner and the owned. The word "ayana" states the relationship between the supporter and the supported. The word "–āya" states the relationship between the enjoyer and the enjoyed. [2] Thus the Tirumantra indeed declares nine kinds of relationships [between the soul and the Lord].

Dvayam Section :

The Dvayam has two sentences, six words, ten meanings, and twenty–five holy syllables. Among these, the first sentence has fifteen holy syllables, and the second sentence has ten holy syllables. That is, "Śrīman nārāyaṇa caraṇau saraṇam prapadye" and "Srīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ" are two sentences. "Śrīmannārāyaṇacaranau," "saraṇam," "prapadye," "śrimate," "nārāyaṇāya," and "namaḥ," are its six words. "Śrī," the suffix "mat," "nārāyaṇa," "caraṇau," "śaraṇam," "prapadye," "śrīmate," "nārāyaṇa," "–āya," and "namaḥ," all have ten meanings.

"Śrī" states that the goddess *(pĕriyapirāṭṭi)* who can't refuse [the soul's request] is the mediator *(puruṣakāratva)*. The suffix

"mat" states that this mediator is in eternal union [with the Lord]. "Nārāyaṇa" states that [the Lord] is endowed with the qualities of affection, etc. (*vātsalyādiguṇayoga*) such that even if the Goddess who mediates in this way should find fault, he would say "My devotees would never do that." [3] "Caraṇau" states the unique figure or body [of the Lord] which is the abode or resting place for those qualities and for the goddess. "Śaraṇam" states that this very figure is the upāya. "Prapadye" states the determination (*adhyavasāya*) of the *adhikāri* who accepts the upāya. "Śrimate" states that this holy couple is the goal. "Nārāyaṇa" states that Our Lord is the master and owner of all (*sarvasvāmitva*).

"-Āya" states the special occupation [of service] performed at his feet. "Namaḥ" concludes by stating the destruction of egoism and possessiveness (*ahaṅkāra*, *mamakāra*) which are the obstacles to this occupation.

What is the essential meaning (*tātparya*) of the Dvayam? What is its meaning as a whole (*vākyārtha*)? What is its primary meaning (*pradhānārtha*)? What is its meditative meaning (*anusandhānārtha*)? Its essential meaning is [conduct] which is approved by the ācārya (*ācāryaruciparigrahītatva*). Its meaning as a whole is its description of the essential nature of the one who is the means (*prāpakasvarūpanirūpaṇa*). Its primary meaning is service to the holy couple. Its meditative meaning is reflection on one's faults (*svadoṣānusandhāna*). Thus the meaning of the Dvayam has been stated.

Caramaśloka Section:

The Caramaśloka has two sentences, eleven words, and thirty-two holy syllables. That is, "Sarvadharmān parityajya mām ekam śaraṇam vraja" and "Aham tvā sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ" are two sentences. "Sarvadharmān," "parityajya," "mām," "ekam," "śaraṇam," "vraja," "aham," "tvā," "sarvapāpebhyo," "mokṣayiṣyāmi," "mā śucaḥ," are eleven words. "Sarvadharmān" states the other upāyas. "Parityajya" states desisting from the other upāyas (*itaropāyanivṛtti*). "Mām" states the actual upāya (*sāmyakkāṇa upāya*). "Ekam" states the self-sufficiency (*nairapekṣya*) of the upāya. "Śaraṇam" states that [the Lord] is the upāya.

"Vraja" states the acceptance of the upāya. "Aham" states his omnipotence (*sarva-śaktitva*). "Tvā" states the essential nature of the *adhikāri* who accepts the upāya. "Sarvapāpebhyaḥ" states obstacles to the goal (*prāpya-pratibandhakaṅkaḷ*). "Mokṣayiṣyāmi" states the destruction of the obstacles to the goal (*prāpyapratibandhakanivṛtti*). "Mā śucaḥ" concludes by saying [to] reflect on one's lack of responsibility (*nirbharatvānusandhāna*).

What is the Caramaśloka's essential meaning (*tātparya*)? What is its meaning as a whole (*vākyārtha*)? What is its primary meaning (*pradhānārtha*)? What is its meditative meaning (*anusandhānārtha*)? Its essential meaning is [conduct] which is approved by the savior (*śaraṇyaruciparigrahītatva*). Its meaning as a whole is a description of the essential nature of the means (*prāpakasvarūpanirūpaṇa*). Its primary meaning is a description of the Lord's essential nature. Its meditative meaning is the reflection on one's lack of responsibility or worries [regarding salvation] (*nirbharatvānusandhāna*). Thus the Caramaśloka has been stated.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. "Paratantraṉukku anurūpamāṉa upāyatvam." It is not clear from the text exactly what it is that the "namas" indicates to be the upāya which is suitable for the one who is dependent. In his *Parantarahasya*, however, in dicussing the word "namas," Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai says that this word "implies that the Lord is the upāya" (p. 14). As it stands, however, this text would allow room for Vedānta Deśika's view that "namas" indicates the performance of *prapatti* or *śaraṇāgati*, the *sādhyopāya* (upāya to be accomplished by the soul) which is in accord with the dependent soul's god-given ability to perform self-initiated action (*jīvakartṛtva*).
2. "bhoktṛtvabhogyatva." It is unclear from the text which is the enjoyer and which is the one to be enjoyed—the Lord or the soul. Piḷḷai Lokācārya's *Navavidhasambandham*, which elaborates these nine relationships as explained in the Tirumantra, says that the fourth case-ending teaches that the soul is the one to be enjoyed by the Lord (*ADR* p. 81).
3. *Pĕriyāḻvār Tirumŏḻi* 4.9.2, *NDP*.

APPENDIX III

GLOSSARY

The glossary below gives the definition of Sanskrit words having a technical meaning or special usage in Śrīvaiṣṇavism that are occasionally used untranslated in the text.

ācārya	a [Śrīvaiṣṇava] guru, religious teacher, leader, and/or author of a religious text.
ādharma	actions prohibited in the śāstras.
adhikāri	the qualificant ; one qualified for, embarking on or engaged in any *sādhana* or *upāya*.
ahaṅkāra	(lit., I–making) egoism, the delusion of being one's own person, obstructing recognition of one's *śeṣatva*.
aṅga	an ancillary or auxiliary practice as part of a main *sādhana*.
aṅgi	the main *sādhana*, to which the auxiliary rites and practices are attached.
añjali	a hand gesture (*mūdra*) of reverence, folding the hands together in front of one's body.

anuvāda	a statement of a situation which has already occurred, one way of interpreting the gerund form of the verb (usually translated as "having (verb)." See *vidhi*.
apṛthaksiddhibhāva	the inseparable relationship between an entity and its qualities or attributes.
arcāvatāra	the incarnation of the Lord in the temple or domestic image worshipped by his devotees.
ārti (*ārtti*)	(lit., pain) eagerness to get out of saṁsāra.
Aṣṭākṣara	another name for the Tirumantra (lit., having eight syllables or letters).
avadhārana	exclusion ; a particle (*tāṉ*, *e*, *eva*) meaning exclusion or "only."
avatāra	the incarnation of the Lord (Viṣṇu) in an animate body (human or animal), such as Kṛṣṇa, Rāma, Narasiṁha.
avyāpaka	(lit., non–pervading) A category of mantras of the Lord which do not refer to his characteristic as the one who pervades the entire universe.
bhāgavata	a devotee of the Lord (Bhagavān).
bhakti	devotion to the Lord ; short for *bhaktiyoga*.
bhaktiyoga	the upāya for mokṣa involving devotional meditation on the Lord, as expounded by Rāmānuja in his *Śrībhāṣya* and *Gītābhāṣya*. It is limited to twice–born males since performance of *nityanaimittikakarmas* is its *aṅga*. It may also be accompanied by *karmayoga* and *jñānayoga* as *aṅgas*.

Caramaśloka	*Bhagavad Gītā* 18:66 "sarva dharmān parityajya, mām ekam śaraṇam vraja; aham tvā sarvapāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi, mā śucaḥ," used as a mantra in Srivaisnavism.
cetana	the sentient, individual soul (syn. *ātmā, jīva*).
cūrṇā	a prose, sūtra-like aphorism in Maṇipravāḷa.
Dvayam	one of the three Śrīvaiṣṇava mantras: "śrīman nārāyaṇa caraṇau śaraṇam prapadye, śrīmate nārāyaṇāya namaḥ."
guṇa	an attribute or quality; one of the three aspects of *prakṛti*: *rajas* (energy), *tamas* (darkness, dullness), or *sattva* (goodness, purity, piety).
guruparamparā	the line of instruction from guru to disciple, to his disciple, etc.; thus the spiritual lineage of an individual or a text.
jñāna	knowledge, wisdom; short for *jñānayoga*.
jñānayoga	the upāya to mokṣa taught in the Upaniṣads involving meditation on the *ātman*. According to Śrīvaiṣṇavism and Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, not a complete path to mokṣa unless accompanied by or culminating in *bhaktiyoga*.
kaivalya	a form of release from saṁsāra (mokṣa) which is characterized by enjoyment of the *ātman* alone, without experience of the Lord. According to the Tĕṉkalai ācāryas, a permanent but inferior kind of mokṣa. According to Vedānta Deśika and the Vaṭakalai school, it is a form of mokṣa, but not necessarily permanent.
karma	1) action or activity in general, which demands experiencing the results in saṁsāra; 2) a rite enjoined in scripture; 3) short for *karmayoga*.

karmayoga	A way to mokṣa, as taught in the *Bhagavad Gītā*, involving performance of scriptural rituals and duties with detachment from the agency and fruits of one's actions.
mamakāra	possessiveness, selfishness, thinking one's actions, body, and possessions to be one's own.
maṅgalasūtra	a thread worn around the neck by married women, signifying their status as married.
mantra	a sacred utterance in general, usually enjoined to be pronounced, muttered, or meditated on as part of a *sādhana*; one of the three Śrīvaiṣṇava mantras (Tirumantra, Dvayam, Caramaśloka).
Mūlamantra	same as Tirumantra.
mumukṣu	one desirous of mokṣa, release from saṁsāra.
namas	homage, reverence (used with dative case noun in an invocation, "homage to . . . ").
pañcasaṁskāra	the rite of initiation into the Śrīvaiṣṇava sect, involving five parts: *tāpa*, *puṇḍra*, *nāma*, *mantra*, and *yāga* See introduction for a full explanation.
prakṛti	material nature, composed of three guṇas or aspects, both in its primoridial or unevolved form, and as evolved into the gross material world. As such, the insentient *tattva* or reality among the three *tattvas* recognized in Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta—*cit* (sentient souls), *acit* (insentient matter, *prakṛti*) and *īśvara* (the Lord).

Praṇava	the sacred syllable *om* as taught in the Upaniṣads (understood to be a contraction of *aum*), which is used as a mantra by itself, or as a component of other mantras (such as the Tirumantra).
prapatti	surrendering to or resorting to the Lord requesting him to be one's upāya or means for salvation (syn. *śaraṇāgati* "taking refuge," *bharanyāsa* "surrendering responsibility.")
prāpaka	means, upaya, that which produces the goal (in prapatti, the Lord himself).
prāpya	goal to be attained, esp. the Lord and communion with him as the soul's ultimate aim.
prāyaścitta	any rite of atonement prescribed in śāstra as expiation for some sin or misdeed.
punaḥprapatti	repeated prapatti, which the Vaṭakalais beleive necessary as a *prāyaścitta* for any subsequent sin after one's prapatti for moksa. The Tēṉkalais think repeated prapatti is unnecessary and in fact a sin.
puruṣārtha	ultimate goal or aim, according to Śrīvaiṣṇavism, release from saṁsāra and attainment of the Lord; any one of the four such aims recognized in the śāstras—*kāma* (pleasure), *artha* (wealth), *dharma* (duty), and *mokṣa* (release from samsara).
rajas	energy, activity, passion—one of the three aspects of *prakṛti*, material nature.
sādhana	a means performed or practiced to attain a goal, as prescribed in śāstra (syn. upāya, prāpaka).

sādhyopāya	a means (to mokṣa) to be effected by the soul, such as bhaktiyoga. See *siddhopāya*.
śaraṇāgati	[the act of] taking refuge, surrendering to the Lord (syn. *prapatti*).
śāstra	scripture in general ; scriptures prescribing dharma (duties).
sattva	goodness, purity, piety—one of the three aspects of *prakṛti*, insentient matter.
śeṣa	Rāmānuja's definition : "that whose essential nature consists solely in being useful to something else by virtue of its intention to contribute excellence to this other thing, the *sesī*" (*Vedārtha Saṅgraha* 182). That is, anything sub-servient to another, esp. the soul as subservient to the Lord
śeṣaśeṣibhāva	The relationship of *śeṣa* and *śeṣī* (often defined in terms of master and slave), esp. as obtaining between the soul (as *śeṣa*) and the Lord (as *śeṣi*).
śeṣatva	the quality of subservience, which carries with it an obligation to glorify the one to whom one is subservient, the *śesī*.
śesī	the master, owner, to one to whom another is subservient (*śeṣa*) ; the Lord as master of all, having all souls and matter as his *śeṣas*.
siddhopāya	the already accomplished upāya or means to mokṣa—that is, the Lord, who becomes the means for salvation for those who surrender to him.
ṣvarūpa	essential or true nature of a thing, esp. the soul's essential nature as a *śeṣa* of the Lord.

tamas	darkness, dullness, lethargy—one of the three aspects of *prakṛti*, material nature.
Tirumantra	"om namo nārāyaṇaya," the oldest of the three Śrīvaiṣṇava mantras.
upāya	a means which produces a goal or aim (syn. *sādhana*, *prāpaka*), esp. a means to moksa.
upeya	the goal to be attained by some means (syn *prāpya*, *sādhya*).
Vaikuṇtha	the Lord's heavenly abode, *paramapada*, where he is served by *muktas* (freed souls) and *nityasūris* (eternally free souls).
vidhi	a commandment, injunction
vyāpaka	a class of mantras to the Lord which refer to his status as the pervader of all—that is, those mantras which contain the words *viṣṇu*, *nārāyaṇa*, or *vāsudeva* as mentioned in the Viṣṇu Gāyatri.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN FOOTNOTES

The following editions (listed by title or abbreviation) have been consulted in preparing the footnotes. This translation of the *Mumuksuppaṭi* of Piḷḷai Lokācārya with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary is based on the text edited and published by S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar (Trichy, 1970). Footnotes reading "Attributed to . . ." mean that S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar's edition attributes the reference to the following source, but the translator has not been able to verify the reference, either because no edition of the text is available or because it cannot be found in the available editions.

ĀcHṛ Ācārya Hṛdayam with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary. In *Śrīmad Varavaramunīndra Granthamālā*, vol. 1. Edited and published by P. B. Annangaracharya. Kanchi, 1966.

ADR Aṣṭādaśa Rahasyam of Piḷḷai Lokācārya. Edited by Ayodhyā Rāmānuja Jīyar. Madras: K. V. Tirukkāccinampi Dāsa, 1911.

Ahīrbudhnya Saṁhitā. Edited by M. D. Ramanujacharya. Adyar Library Series vol. 4, 2 pts. Madras: Adyar Library, 1966.

Amarakośa [Namaliṅgānusasanam] of Amarasiṁha. Edited by Cintāmaṇi Śāstri. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1882.

Aruḷiccĕyal Rahasya of Alakiyamaṇavāḷa Pĕrumāl Nāyaṉār. Edited by Velukkuti Varadacharya Swami. Trichy: S. Krisnaswami Iyengar, 1972.

Arumpatavilakkam of Toṭṭayaṅkār and Śuddhasatva Empāvaiyyaṅkār (sub-commentary on *Mumukṣuppaṭi* with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary). Madras : Tiruveṅkatācārya Memorial Press, 1890.

Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. Bombay : Khemaraj Srikrishnadas, 1954.

Bhāgavata Purāṇa. Bombay : Śrī Veṅkateśvara Steam Press, 1914.

BhG Bhagavad Gīta with Rāmānuja's *[Gītā]bhāṣya* and Vedānta Deśika's *Tātparyacandrikā*. Edited and published by U.T. Viraraghavacharya. Madras : 1972.

BS Brahma Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa, with Rāmānuja's *Śrībhāṣya*, Sudarśana Sūri's *Śrutaprakāśikā*, and Śrī Raṅgarāmānuja's *Bhāvaprakāśika*. 7 vols. Edited and published by Dharanidhara Sastri. Brindavan : 1925.

Garuḍa Purāṇa. Delhi : Nag Publishers, 1984.

Gopathabrāhmaṇa of the *Atharvaveda*. Calcutta : Narayana Press, 1891.

Guruparamparā Prabhavam 6,000. Edited and published by S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Trichy, 1975.

Lakṣmī Tantra. Edited by V. Krisnamacharya. Adyar Library Series, vol 87. Madras : Adyar Library, 1959.

Mahābhārata, southern recension. Ed. T. R. Krisnacharya and T. R. Vyasacharya. Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1906.

Manusmṛti with Kullūkabhaṭṭar's commentary. Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1909.

Mbh Mahābhārata. Critical edition by Vishnu S. Sukthankar, et. al. 19 vols. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1927–66.

Mīmāṁsā Sūtras of Jaimini with the commentary of Śrīpartha sārathi Miśra. Edited by P. S. Rāma Miśra Śāstri. Benares : E. J. Lazarus, 1891.

Nācciyār Tirumŏḻi, of Āṇṭāḷ with Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's commentary. Edited by Akkārakkaṉi Rāghavācarya. Madras : Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Mudrāpaka Sabhā, 1923.

Narasiṁha Purāṇa. Edited by Uddhavācārya. Bombay : Gopala Narayana Company, 1911.

NDP Nālāyira Divya Prabandham. Edited by K. V. Venkataswami Reddiyar. Madras : Tiruvenkatattan Tirumanram, 1981.

Nyāsavimśati [Nyaasa Viṁśati] of Vedānta Deśika with meaning and commentary in English by D. Ramaswamy Ayyangar. Madras : Viśishṭādvaita Pracharinī Sabhā, 1979.

Parantarahasya and *Māṇikkamālai* of Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai. Edited by P. B. Annangaracharya. Madras and Kanchi : Sat Grantha Prakāśana Sabhā, 1949.

Paramasaṁhitā. Edited and translated by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. Baroda : Gaekwad Oriental Series, 1940.

Rā Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. Critical edition by G. H. Bhatt, et. al. 7 vols. Baroda : Oriental Institute, 1960–75.

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki according to the southern readings (southern recension). 2nd edition, 2 vols. Edited T. R. Krishnamacharya. Madras : T. K. Venkobacharya, 1930.

Ṛg *Veda Saṁhitā* with the commentary of Sāyaṇācārya, vol. 1. Second critical edition. Poona: Vaidika Samśodhana Mandala, 1972.

RTS Śrīmad Rahasyatrayasāra of Vedānta Deśika. Edited and published, with commentary by U. T. Viraraghavacharya. 2 vols. Madras : 1980.

SM Stotramālā. Edited and published by P. B. Annangaracharya. Kanchi : 1969.

SS Smṛtisamuccaya. Edited and published by Hari Narayana Apte. Poona : 1905.

ŚVB Śrīvacana Bhūṣaṇa of Piḷḷai Lokācārya with Maṇavāḷamāmuni's commentary. Edited by P. Raghava Ramanuja Swami. Madras : R. Rajagopala Naidu, Celvarangan Press, 1936.

Taittirīya Saṁhitā. Edited by Satvalekar. Aund, Maharashtra : Bharata Press, 1954.

Tiruppāvai of Āṇṭāḷ with Pĕriyavāccṉ Piḷḷai's commentary. Edited and published by P. B. Annangaracharya. Kanchi : 1970.

Tiruviruttam of Nammāḻvār with Pĕriyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai's commentary. Madras : Śrīvaiṣṇava Grantha Mudrāpaka Sabhā, 1903.

TVM Tiruvāymŏḻi of Nammāḻvār. In *Bhagavad Viṣayam* (the collection of Śrīvaiṣṇava commentaries on *Tiruvāymŏḻi*). Edited and published by P. B. Annangaracharya. 5 vols. Kanchi : 1975–6.

US Upaniṣat-Sangrahaḥ. Edited by J. L. Shastri. Delhi . Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

Vedārtha Saṅgraha. Edited and translated by S. S. Raghavachar. Mysore : Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, 1978.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa [Śrīviṣṇupurāṇam]. Edited by P. B. Annangaracharya. Kanchipuram : Granthamālā Kāryālaya, 1972.

Viṣṇu Sahasranāma [Śrī Vishṇu Sahasranāma] with the commentary of Parāśara Bhaṭṭar. Translated by A. Srinivasa Raghavan. Madras : Viśishtādvaita Prachārinī Sabhā, 1983.